

5120. Also, petition from Humbert F. DeRosa, of Utica, N. Y., suggesting amendments to the watch schedule of the pending tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5121. Also, petition of Clark and seven others, of the thirty-third district of New York, favoring passage of the Chandler bill (H. R. 9198) providing old-age pensions for veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

5122. By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of the Varnum Continentals, of East Greenwich, R. I., urging that the minimum strength of the Army be 150,000 men and 13,000 officers and that the Navy personnel be at least 93,000 men; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5123. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Chartiers Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, Hickory, Pa., indorsing Senate Joint Resolution 31, proposing a constitutional amendment authorizing Congress to enact uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce; also indorsing House Joint Resolution 131, proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5124. Also, petition of Chartiers Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church, of Hickory, Pa., indorsing House bill 9753, to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5125. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution adopted by the United Veterans of the Republic, Unit No. 12, of Charlestown, Mass., relative to the personnel of the Navy and the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5126. Also, resolution adopted by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, opposing any amendment of the transportation act which will deprive the Interstate Commerce Commission of its power over intrastate rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5127. Also, resolution adopted by the Navy League of the United States, urging that the personnel of the Navy be maintained at not less than the ratio of 5-5-3 to that of the British and Japanese Navies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, April 15, 1922.

(Legislative day of Friday, April 14, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard
Borah	Hale	Lenroot	Shortridge
Bursum	Harrell	Lodge	Simmons
Calder	Harris	McCormick	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Caraway	Heflin	Moses	Stanley
Colt	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sterling
Culberson	Johnson	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Swanson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Edge	Kellogg	Oddie	Trammell
Ernst	Kendrick	Overman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	King	Pomerene	Watson, Ga.
Glass	Ladd	Reed	Willis

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness in his family. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. DIAL. My colleague [Mr. SMITH] is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may continue through the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, 1923 (S. DOC. NO. 185).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Department of State (foreign intercourse), fiscal year 1923, for revision of Chinese customs tariff, and inquiry into extraterritoriality in China, \$68,750; for commission of jurists to consider amendment of laws of war, \$3,750; and for claims of the Government of Norway, \$2,200; in total amount \$74,700, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Emery-Eckington Parent-Teachers' Association, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3136, providing for increased salaries to school-teachers in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted by Dominion Local No. 1, Western Progressive Grange, of Dominion, Wash., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2604, the Ladd honest money bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented the petitions of J. I. Framvorg and 10 others, of Bergen; B. J. Swang and 46 others, of Harvey; and W. G. Safford and 92 others, of Hillsboro and vicinity, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation reviving the United States Grain Corporation, so as to stabilize prices of certain farm products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## COMMISSIONS TO MIDSHIPMEN IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 274) authorizing the commissioning in the Marine Corps of midshipmen under certain conditions, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 602) thereon.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 3465) to amend section 42 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 3466) for the relief of the widows of certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 3467) granting a pension to Mary G. Grover (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 3468) to empower the Bureau of Efficiency, subject to the approval of the President, to establish a system of efficiency ratings for the classified service in the several executive departments and independent establishments, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, based upon records kept in each department and independent establishment with such frequency as to make them as nearly as possible records of fact; to the Committee on Civil Service.

## TARIFF BILL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. JOHNSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7456, the tariff bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is before the Senate and will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) extending the operation of the immigration act of May 19, 1921, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment, in line 5, after "June 30," to strike out "1923" and insert "1924, unless otherwise repealed," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the operation of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, is extended to and including June 30, 1924, unless otherwise repealed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer a substitute for the pending joint resolution. I do not ask to have it read at this particular time. I have offered it and I will give some explanation of the substitute.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as this matter is likely to be passed upon now, if it does not interfere with the Senator's plan I would like to have the substitute read so that we may understand what it is.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say before it is read that the substitute which I have offered for the pending joint resolution includes the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigration. Only one exception is made. It excludes the recommendation of the commissioner that the quota from any one country may be 1,500. It was my opinion that under the 3 per cent restriction if a country's quota was 250, no more than that number should be permitted to enter the United States. With that single exception the substitute which I have offered includes the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigra-

tion as to the amendment of the present immigration law. It does not change the 3 per cent quota at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Mississippi how his substitute differs, if at all, from the substitute which I presented some days ago?

Mr. HARRISON. I have forgotten what the Senator's substitute is.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute which I have offered limits immigration for five years, but excludes clauses (1) to (8), inclusive, of the present law.

Mr. HARRISON. I will proceed with my explanation and then have my substitute for the joint resolution read.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I am anxious to understand the Senator's substitute. Does it include the amendment proposed to the committee as set forth on page 9 of the committee report?

Mr. HARRISON. It is carried in the report of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator will recall that the commissioner made certain recommendations to the committee. If he has the report of the committee before him he will find those recommendations set forth on page 9.

Mr. HARRISON. It includes all those recommendations.

Mr. WILLIS. And what else?

Mr. HARRISON. It is exactly the confidential print which was before the Committee on Immigration, and which did include all these suggestions. I am going to yield to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], in a moment, but before doing so I wish to say that my proposed substitute makes it a matter of permanent law. It changes the 2 per cent limitation which was applied and merely carries it out, leaving the 3 per cent quota as it was. As I understand the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], he proposes a complete restriction for five years.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; with certain exceptions which are mentioned in the substitute which I have offered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to say that I have not examined the substitute which the Senator has offered, and so I do not know that I have any objection to it, but it seems to me that what we ought to do now is to make sure that the present law does not lapse on the 30th of June. If we undertake at this moment to revise the entire immigration act, it will take us a good while. The most important thing is to get the pending joint resolution passed in order to make sure that the present law is extended. I am in favor of a revision of the present law. I know that the Commissioner of Immigration has made some very important suggestions. I think we ought to go over the whole law and I suppose that will soon be done. But it seems to me that it is of first importance at this moment to make sure that the present law does not lapse on the 30th of June.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, before I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, that I have suggested in my substitute no change of the 3 per cent quota provision; I knew that would start discussion and that the two Houses might not agree on it; but I do think, and I believe if the committee had investigated the proposition they would have thought, that the recommendations of the Commissioner of Immigration were wise. They are not included.

I wish now to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and then I shall answer the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that it might kill the joint resolution if we did not adopt it exactly as the House passed it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I promised to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a moment to have read, so that he can discuss in connection with his substitute, the amendment which I have proposed?

Mr. COLT. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending, but the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be read for the information of the Senate.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, insert the following:

No alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States unless transported to the United States in a vessel documented under the laws of the United States, as defined in the shipping act of 1916, as amended; but this provision shall not apply to persons included in clauses (1) to (8), inclusive, of subdivision (a) or in the

second proviso of subdivision (d) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) which has been favorably reported by the Immigration Committee and is now before the Senate, continues the present immigration law for two years instead of for one, as passed by the House. That is the effect of the amendment reported by the committee.

The two most striking facts brought out in the operation of this law are, first, that the immigration from northern and western Europe is of a permanent character, while the immigration from southern and eastern Europe is of a temporary character; and, second, that the immigration movement from southern and eastern Europe is offset by the departures, or home-returning movement, of this group of aliens.

The following figures are taken from a report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, giving the quotas, the admissions, and the departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922, a period of eight months:

Table giving the quotas, admissions, and departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922.

NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE.

	Quota.	Immigrant aliens admitted.	De-parted.
United Kingdom.....	77,296	23,248	6,903
Germany.....	68,039	11,678	2,908
France.....	5,692	3,445	1,507
Belgium.....	1,557	1,459	818
Norway.....	12,116	2,745	956
Denmark.....	5,644	1,742	494
Sweden.....	19,956	4,026	1,212
Switzerland.....	3,745	2,339	632
Netherlands.....	3,602	1,299	600
Total.....	197,557	51,981	15,930
Net gain.....			36,051

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. COLT. I prefer, as the statement I am making is a short one, not to be interrupted until after I have finished.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. COLT. Now, contrast the statistics of immigration from northern and western Europe with the statistics of immigration from southern and eastern Europe, which are as follows:

Table giving the quotas, admissions, and departures under the present 3 per cent law from July 1, 1921, to February 28, 1922.

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

	Quota.	Immigrant aliens admitted.	De-parted.
Italy.....	42,021	39,181	42,371
Poland.....	25,800	27,108	27,395
Russia.....	34,247	9,539	4,665
Greece.....	3,286	3,384	5,667
Portugal.....	2,239	1,723	4,928
Other countries (southern and eastern Europe).....	46,750	38,638	28,217
Total.....	154,373	119,606	113,243
Net gain.....			6,363
Total net gain in immigration.....			42,411

It will be noticed that from Poland the immigration exceeded the quota, but that more Poles departed from our shores than were admitted.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COLT. I would prefer not to be interrupted until I have finished this short statement.

It will be noted that out of 51,981 alien immigrants admitted from northern and western Europe only 15,930 returned, while out of 119,606 alien immigrants admitted from southern and eastern Europe 113,243 returned. In other words, out of a net increase of 42,411 in our alien-immigrant population from Europe during eight months, 36,051 were from northern and western Europe and only 6,363 from southern and eastern Europe.

These figures further show that there is no marked immigration movement to the United States from northern and western Europe. There were admissible under the quota law 197,649 from northern and western Europe and only 51,981 were admitted, or less than one-third the number admissible. There



were admissible from the United Kingdom 77,206 and only 23,248 came. Out of 68,039 admissible from Germany only 11,678 came. Out of 12,116 admissible from Norway only 2,745 came, and out of 19,956 admissible from Sweden only 4,026 came. Instead of conditions following the Great War producing, as many predicted, an increasing flow of immigration from these countries, especially from Germany, these conditions have tended to check immigration.

In regard to the immigration from southern and eastern Europe we find this situation, a relatively strong immigration movement to the United States and a substantially equal return movement. From Italy 39,181 came in during eight months and 42,371 departed—and, mind you, Mr. President, I am confining myself strictly to immigrant aliens—from Poland 27,108 came in and 27,395 departed; 3,384 came in from Greece and 5,667 went back; from Russia 9,569 came in and 4,665 departed—that is the only important exception where the number of those who departed was not in excess of the number who came in—from Portugal 1,726 came in and 4,928 returned.

These figures show that however strong the tide of immigration may be from southern and eastern Europe it is met by a counter returning movement. If there are causes which impel a large body of these immigrants to come to this country, there are also causes which impel a large body to return to the country of their birth.

One of the causes of the movement of peoples from one country to another is economic and another cause is political. I believe that the economic rehabilitation of Europe has tended to check immigration and also has tended to increase the returning flow. I also believe that the destruction of autocracy and the establishment of new republics in Europe have tended to retard immigration and have also tended to increase the return movement. A striking example of the effect of political changes upon the return movement is shown in the case of the Polish race. During eight months, from July 1 to February 28, 5,963 Polish immigrants were admitted to the United States and 25,166 returned to Poland.

Mr. TOWNSEND. During what month was that?

Mr. COLT. During the eight months of the operation of the law, from the 1st of July to the 28th of February. In round numbers 5,000 Polish immigrants were admitted and 25,000 Polish immigrants returned to Poland during that time.

As to the general effect upon immigration of the operation of the law for eight months it may be said that the number of alien immigrants from southern and eastern Europe admitted to the United States is only about 6,000 more than the number who have departed, and that the number of alien immigrants from northern and western Europe admitted to the United States during this time is only about 36,000 in excess of those who have departed.

Such defects and hardships as have been disclosed in the practical administration of the law have been in part corrected and these corrective efforts will be continued. I might say with regard to immigration that the facts are so complex that it is very difficult to frame even a reasonably perfect immigration law; and, therefore, there ought to be a great deal of administrative power lodged in the Department of Labor. In other words, the law should be made elastic enough to prevent what might be called tragedies, so that the law could be administered with humanity.

The Commissioner General of Immigration, Mr. Husband, says—and mark this:

I am quite sure that some of the administrative difficulties of the past can be avoided or considerably minimized in the future, even though the law is extended without amendments as the House joint resolution provides.

With respect to amendments, there was such a division in the committee as to what amendments should be adopted, and the whole subject of amendments opened up such a wide field that the committee deemed it best at this time simply to extend the law without any change in its provisions. When you once opened the door to amendment you had three classes of amendments proposed, and each one of those classes represented a distinct opinion in the committee. You had restrictive amendments, you had amendments which liberalized, and you had constructive amendments. When once you had opened the door to the admission of amendments, all the parties who offered these different kinds of amendments would be entitled to be heard. As was said by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] a moment ago, the country ought to know and the world ought to know what the immigration law is going to be for the next year, because in an immigration law it is necessary that the law should not go into effect until a considerable time after its passage. One of the difficulties with respect to the administration of the present law was that there was not

sufficient time to give notice to the peoples who wanted to come to this country, and therefore during the month of June there was great confusion.

Since the next session of Congress is the short session, the committee also deemed it wise to make the extension for two years instead of one. This extension for one or two years—and the committee, by a majority, thought it was best to make it for two years—it is believed will give time to frame a bill covering constructive legislation along two lines—along the line of selection at the source, and along the line of distribution upon arrival in this country.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, how does this joint resolution tend to correct the tragedies that the Senator talks about in the interest of humanity? Is any latitude given to the commissioner to admit those who ought to be admitted?

Mr. COLT. I might say that the Commissioner General of Immigration has met that situation by requiring the immigrant to give bond. I might say that this law is supplemental to the old law of immigration, and under certain conditions of hardship the commissioner general has fallen back upon the rules of the old law, of which this law is an amendment. I believe that the Commissioner General of Immigration and the Secretary of Labor have endeavored in every way to meet and to overcome these hardships and difficulties. Those hardships and difficulties arose largely in the beginning of the operation of this law, in the beginning of this restrictive legislation, before the immigrants had had full notice of the law. I believe, as the Commissioner General of Immigration says, that those hardships have been largely corrected by administrative rules and regulations, and that if we pass this joint resolution just as it is, extending the time, there will be little or no complaint as to hardships in the future.

I might say that the time is short between now and the 1st of July. I believe that this joint resolution should pass at once. Then if there are any amendments to the act which it is thought best to bring before the Senate for consideration we shall have plenty of time to perfect the law. The situation to-day, to my mind, is that this extension should be granted at once and that whatever amendments may be deemed necessary should come up as separate pieces of legislation.

I want to say that the experience of the House, when they entered into the question of perfecting this measure or of framing a constructive bill, was that they found such a difference of opinion after prolonged hearings and discussion that they reached the conclusion I have reached under similar conditions, that the only thing to be done now to meet the present situation is to continue the present law for one or two years.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there is nothing complex about this proposition. I concede to no Senator here a greater interest in the restriction of foreign immigration than myself. I would not do anything to jeopardize legislation that will take care of the situation, but we must have courage in dealing with these questions. This is the 15th of April. The present law does not expire until the 30th day of June, so you have a long time to legislate if you will get busy.

There is not a suggestion embodied in the substitute I have offered that has not been considered by the House Immigration Committee. More than that, there is not a suggestion embodied in the substitute I have offered that has not already been adopted by the House Immigration Committee. If that be true—and no one will deny it—then where will any delay come from adopting a substitute that carries out the recommendations of the Commissioner General of Immigration, who says in his report that in some cases they are necessary to the strict enforcement of restriction on immigration?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator claim that the provisions of his substitute have received consideration at the hands of the Senate Committee on Immigration?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will just let me proceed, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate, and I shall be very brief, because I know that the substitute I have offered is important, and I know that if Senators will stay in their seats and consider this proposition they will adopt this substitute.

Here is what happened in the Immigration Committee, and I am not revealing any of its secrets. We met for the first time in months and months. The immigration question has long been an important one. I might say that there are few questions of greater importance to the American people than the restriction of immigration, and that has been true for some time. Why, when we had this matter up before the Senate



Committee on Immigration, I think a year ago, the evidence that came to us was that at Danzig and other places prospective immigrants by the thousands were standing in line for days and for nights waiting to get their passports viséed so that they might come to America. Those were the facts. Periodicals and newspapers and all kinds of organizations had urged Congress to take care of the situation, and it was that menace that forced Congress to pass the present law; so when the Senate committee met a week ago, after a long delay, this joint resolution that has been passed by the House was presented to us. The Commissioner General of Immigration had made certain suggestions as to changes in the present law. Those changes are incorporated in my substitute. I made a motion to the committee to invite your Commissioner General of Immigration to appear before the committee that he might present this matter to the committee and that the committee might consider and pass upon it. Aye, I went further than that. Some weeks ago the President selected Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore—a very splendid lady, accomplished, versed, I presume, in immigration questions—and she was commissioned by the President, your President, to go abroad and study this question from every angle and to return to this country as soon as she could and make a report to the Secretary of Labor. I assume that the President thought it was an important question, and pressing, or he would not have looked all over the country and selected Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore to make this investigation; and so she went abroad. She returned only a few days ago. She filed a report—I have it here—to the Secretary of Labor, and she says that what we ought to do is to have a holiday for five years, preventing any immigration to this country within that time. She says that there are hordes of people, undesirable immigrants, who are waiting anxiously, desirous to come to this country to live.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I suggest to the Senator that it will add strength to his argument and to the report of Mrs. Moore to remember that we have 6,000,000 men unemployed in this country now.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; 6,000,000 men unemployed in this country to-day, factories closed down, wages being cut, empty box cars everywhere, men and women going hungry and in rags and tatters. Yet you say we have not time to study a proposition in which the American people are vitally interested and have been urging us for months and for years to do something about. The trouble is not a lack of time; it is a lack of courage upon our part to handle the question.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we ought to remember in this connection that since this administration went into power and the deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board went into effect there has been a suicide for every 25 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. There is a terrible and deplorable situation in this country. You admit it; you know it. I want to read just a few extracts from Mrs. Lillian Russell Moore's report, which the Committee on Immigration, of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio is a member, considered. What the committee did was discourteous to Mrs. Moore; it was discourteous to the Commissioner of Immigration and to the President of the United States not to have called in Mrs. Moore and Mr. Husband, and let them make their reports to the committee when that matter was being considered. This is what Mrs. Moore said in part:

The higher civilizations of past ages, history teaches us, succumbed to such foreign invasions as now threaten us.  
Allen infiltration wrecked Rome and Greece.

I believe it would be a good thing for America if an immigration "holiday" of five years could be declared.

If the present law restricting immigration by quotas from other countries is continued, it should be materially strengthened, as I have suggested.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. One moment; just let me finish reading this. The report continues:

If Congressmen should go abroad they could see the facts as I saw them. One particular fact is that no good immigration is turning our way. The good inhabitants of every foreign country are needed there, and can possibly be happier and more contented there than in America.

There is more to this immigration problem than the economic side. Warning has been issued through the German Red Cross that the United States must be on its guard against the introduction of cholera and typhus by Russian immigrants. Hordes of these people, Dr. A. Schlesinger officially announced, are pouring into Germany over the Polish, Letvian, and Esthonian borders, and many are seeking passports to America, where they have relatives and friends who are financing them for their journey.

It is fortunate for the United States that Congress enacted the 3 per cent quota law. It is doing much good. With some of the additions I have suggested it would be quite efficient. Its chief weakness is the lack of power held by our consuls abroad. There, it seems to me, is the foundation of all the trouble.  
If we do not keep up the bars and make them higher and stronger there will no longer be an America for Americans.

Before I yield, Mr. President, I ask permission to incorporate this report following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Appendix A.)

Mr. HARRISON. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The inquiry I was going to propound was not very important, but I wanted to inquire when Lillian Russell became an authority on the rise and fall of the Roman Empire? I admit she is a pretty high authority on matters theatrical, and perhaps on cosmetics, but I never knew until just now that she had entered the other field.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not know she was an authority on the rise and fall of the Roman Empire until I read this report. Indeed, I did not know she was an authority on the immigration question until President Harding commissioned her—

Mr. MOSES. The Senator seems to quote her with great approval.

Mr. HARRISON. But she must be or she would not have been selected by the President. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I remarked that the Senator from Mississippi seemed to quote Mrs. Moore with great approval.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator like to have me quote from the appointee of his own President, one who was commissioned in such an important task as this? Are the Senator and his colleagues not to take into consideration any of the reports made by these people? When these people are appointed and go abroad and travel in foreign countries, trying to serve their people and their Government, is not the Senator to pay any attention at all to their reports?

Mr. MOSES. I have read this report. I simply wanted to point out the incongruity of the Senator criticizing Mrs. Moore in one breath because she was not an authority on immigration, when he had already been quoting her with great approval before that. I wish to say further with reference to the particular matter now under discussion—that is, this immediate phase of the debate—that I think it highly undignified and most ungentlemanly.

Mr. HARRISON. That is about the height to which the Senator from New Hampshire can go.

Mr. MOSES. I admit that I do not rise to the height of assailing ladies on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. I refuse to yield to the Senator. I have not said a word in criticism of Mrs. Moore. I would not. I agree with her views. She has voiced my sentiments. I think she is quite a remarkable and accomplished lady. I said that in the course of my remarks. I did not know that she was an authority on immigration questions until she was appointed by President Harding. If that carries with it a criticism, then the Senator can accept it as such. He is just about that big.

Mr. MOSES. I have already done so.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to say, so that I will not be misunderstood, that I am not criticizing the Senator for quoting this authority. It is probably the best agency that has been employed by this administration. The Senator naturally has to turn to that source for his facts, under the circumstances, but I still raise the question as to the high authority and the controlling weight of an opinion by this lady upon international law or immigration questions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRISON. Before I yield let me answer the Senator from Missouri. I am not basing my argument on any report of Mrs. Moore; not at all. That is just part of the case. I am basing my substitute on the recommendation of Mr. Husband, the Commissioner of Immigration, and appointee of this administration, a man who I believe knows more about the immigration question to-day than anyone else in the United States. I have great respect for his judgment, and I am willing to follow him more quickly than those Senators on the other side who are opposing his recommendation and refusing to follow him in this instance. I have the good of the country at heart.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's substitute leaves the 3 per cent provision as it is, and I offer an amendment changing that so as not to allow any but the accepted class to come in for five years, and I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi will not accept that amendment?



Mr. HARRISON. I am in this attitude, Mr. President, that I would vote and I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, but my substitute is pending. I do not believe the Senate will accept a holiday of five years, although I am going to vote for it, and I am in favor of it in the event my amendment is not adopted.

I am hoping that my substitute will be adopted. I have drawn the substitute conservatively, because I did not want to complicate the proposition. I wanted to keep the simple issue before the Senate, not change the 3 per cent quota but only to carry out the recommendations of the administrative officer having the immigration question in charge.

Mr. HARRIS. I withdraw my amendment, and will offer it if the substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi is voted down.

Mr. HARRISON. In the year ending June 30, 1921, 978,163 immigrants of all kinds entered this country. Of course, some went away. Eight hundred and five thousand two hundred and twenty-eight immigrant aliens entered this country that year, and, mark you, for about 26 days during that year this 3 per cent quota was in operation, which cut down the number of immigrants coming into this country. If it had not been for that, there would have been many more.

For the 10 years up to 1912, I think, approximately 11,000,000 immigrants came into the United States. In my opinion, the 3 per cent quota law, which is now on the statute books, has worked well. It is a good law. It does not go as far as I would have had it go, but it has cut down the number of immigrants coming into this country.

For instance, during the time this law has been in operation something over 200,000 immigrants have come into this country. I think under the 3 per cent quota 350,000 immigrants a year are allowed to come in, there being a particular quota each country can send here.

Mr. CALDER. If the Senator will permit me, that is 350,000 from Europe, I believe. The figures show that the quota was 351,930 from Europe.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island. The 3 per cent law allows only 357,000 immigrants to come into this country each year. No such number do come, because certain countries do not send their full quotas. No country can send more than its quota, although during the last year, because of peculiar circumstances, some countries have sent more than their quotas. I believe during the operation of the 3 per cent quota law there have been 15 countries which have sent more than their quotas, but I assume it was because in the beginning of the operation of the 3 per cent quota law a great many immigrants came to this country through the encouragement of the steamship companies, landed at New York, had to be taken care of, and were admitted into this country. They had started from their respective countries before the law was passed. This should not and doubtless will not happen again.

A remarkable situation is presented under this law, however, which illustrates more than anything else, and will convince anyone more than any other proposition, that it is a good law or that the quota system is an improvement over the old system. We have desired immigration from western Europe. The undesirable immigration to this country has come from eastern and southern Europe, and under the 3 per cent quota law immigration coming to this country from the desirable sections of Europe has shown a large increase, proportionate to the number of immigrants, and immigration has fallen off proportionately from the eastern and southern sections of Europe.

For instance, the figures show that from northern and western Europe for the period from July to December, 1913, 142,776 immigrants came to the United States. From southern and eastern Europe and Asiatic Turkey there were 568,001.

In the period from July to December, 1921, the number had fallen off. From northern and western Europe there were 70,974, and from southern and eastern Europe there were 112,239.

In the period from July to December, 1913, the immigrants coming into the United States from northern and western Europe were 19.4 per cent of all the immigrants during that period who came into this country. In the period from July to December, 1921, it rose to 38.5 per cent, showing that there was an increase in the number of desirable immigrants to this country; while from eastern and southern Europe, in 1913, from July to December, the percentage was 77.2, and in the period from July to December, 1921, it had fallen down to 56 per cent. So the system is working well; but we want to remedy the defects in the present law, and the person above all others in the United States who knows the defects in the present law is the administrative officer of the Immigration Bureau.

Now, what does he say? Under the present law immigrants can come into the country from Canada, from Cuba, from Mexico, after one year's residence there. The Commissioner of Immigration has said that there are thousands upon thousands of undesirable immigrants from Europe and elsewhere who have gone to Canada, Mexico, and Cuba in order to live there one year and then obtain admittance into the United States. So he recommends that the law be changed, and he says it is necessary to change it, that it is imperative that it be changed from one year's residence in Cuba, Mexico, or Canada to five years' residence there. I submit if there were no other amendment adopted by the Senate, that one amendment should be adopted. If we do not adopt it, the whole 3 per cent quota law will fail and can not be successful.

The other change that is suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration is this: The present law imposes no penalty upon steamship companies for violating the rules and regulations and laws of the land respecting immigration. They may go abroad, they may encourage any number of undesirable immigrants to come to this country, who may come into the port of New York and flood every part of Ellis Island or other port of entry, as the case may be. They may be hungry there and penniless, as they were, and organizations of various kinds have had to take care of those people when they were landed there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

They were landed there through the instrumentality of the steamship companies, encouraged by them, and the quota that should have come was gradually increased because of the activities and influences of the steamship companies. Under the present law no penalty can be imposed upon the companies, and the Commissioner of Immigration has suggested that the law should be amended so as to impose a penalty of \$200 on every steamship company that brings an alien to this country from a country whose quota has been exhausted and to compel the steamship company to pay back to that alien the expenses incurred in coming here upon a fruitless mission. Is not that important? The Commissioner of Immigration says it is. We all know the steamship companies should be punished when they violate the regulations, and so I have proposed in my substitute an amendment carrying out that idea.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. That provision as to steamship companies exists, as the Senator well knows, in existing law, but it is not applied to the law now under discussion.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it is not applied to this law.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator stated specifically that it did not exist at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, it does not exist as applied to the 3 per cent quota law.

Mr. LODGE. It does not exist as applied to this law, but the Senator gave the idea that we have no penalties applicable to the steamship companies. Such a provision has been carried in the law for years and it ought to be applied to this law. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I am complaining about—that the penalty now in force does not apply to the 3 per cent quota law, and it should apply to it. Does anyone tell me we should not make that change because we have not the time? We ought to have the courage to take the time and amend our laws when conditions demand it.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Has the Senator studied this question from the standpoint of the vast increase of crime in this country? Does he see any connection between foreign immigration and the increase in crime?

Mr. HARRISON. I think there is no doubt that crime increases according to the increase of undesirable immigration into the country. Crime and everything in the way of disorder increases.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that in nearly every one of the brutal, fearful crimes, which seem to be organized, systematized, commercialized, the names of the leading criminals are foreign names. They are not American names.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand the provision reported by the committee, it extends the law for two years. If the amendment proposed by the committee is not adopted it means only



a nullification of the existing law, because under the present law, even if it be extended two years, all an immigrant has to do is to go to Canada or Cuba or Mexico and stay there one year and then he will be permitted to come into this country without any restriction whatsoever. That is really a nullification of the present law.

I think possibly the statistics which were given by the Senator from Mississippi did not include the immigrants who came in from Canada, Mexico, or Cuba, which is permitted under the law. If we are going to have the 3 per cent law extended two years and allow Mexico, Cuba, and Canada to be a mere dumping ground where foreigners can come simply for the purpose of staying one year and then coming into the United States without restriction, I can not see why Senators should object to an amendment covering that situation. Does the Senator expect to offer the amendment separately?

Mr. HARRISON. No; I am offering mine as a substitute for the joint resolution, that carries with it the various amendments which I am going to discuss. I do not think the Senator from Rhode Island has any objection to the amendments. The only question is that he is afraid that the joint resolution might not be agreed to by the House with those amendments, but I do not feel that way about it because the House can adopt every amendment that I am proposing in the substitute by moving to concur in whatever the Senate has done or otherwise, and it will become a law just as quickly as it would if we passed the joint resolution extending it as the committee has suggested.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Very gladly.

Mr. COLT. The Senator is dealing with the amendments proposed by the Commissioner General of Immigration. I entirely agree that certain of his suggestions would perfect the law, but when in the committee we opened up the question of amendments there were other members of the committee who wanted to go beyond these suggestions, and there were other amendments offered and the time was getting so short that we reached—whether the judgment was right or not—the conclusion that it was better to pass the pending joint resolution in the form in which the House passed it and then supplement it later with other legislation.

I would like to ask the Senator if he has considered the Husband amendment referred to on page 13 of his letter to the chairman, increasing the quotas from Australia, Africa, other Europe, and other Asia?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not included that amendment in my substitute.

Mr. COLT. So the Senator does not agree to some of the suggestions of Mr. Husband?

Mr. HARRISON. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, I do not agree with that one. That would tend, in fact, it would have the effect of increasing the number of immigrants permitted to come to the United States over the 3 per cent quota now allowed. I shall vote for no amendment, nor champion any suggestion, that will increase immigration to this country. My tendency is to decrease, rather than increase, the number.

Mr. COLT. The Senator does not agree with the commissioner general's suggestion where he says, substantially, that it would not be just to admit from Australia only several hundred British subjects and that there ought to be a pre-war minimum admitting 1,000?

There are two schools of thought here, and we must dwell upon it—those who are in favor of absolute suspension of immigration for five years and who are in favor of every restrictive measure and those who are not in favor of such restrictions but are in favor of the quota provision.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, under the interpretation given to the existing law there is no limitation upon the number of people from any country who can go into Canada, Mexico, or Cuba, and if they stay there one year there is then absolutely no limitation on the number of those people who can legally come into this country. Is not that true?

Mr. COLT. Under the present law there is no limitation.

Mr. SWANSON. Then we are in this condition under the existing law, if not modified by the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, that really we have no immigration law restricting immigration from anywhere if the steamship companies wish to take foreigners into Canada, Cuba, or Mexico and let them re-

main there one year for the purpose of then coming to the United States without restriction.

Mr. COLT. The present law says they must remain there for one year.

Mr. SWANSON. Yes; they can go there for the purpose of coming to the United States and violating our laws, and in that way we get all the undesirables. Those who desire to do so can remain there, of course. It really nullifies our existing law at the end of a year under those conditions, does it not?

Mr. COLT. Will the Senator deal with facts somewhat and not with the fear that there are thousands and thousands going to those border countries?

Mr. SWANSON. I have information to that effect.

Mr. COLT. As a matter of fact, Mr. Husband says immigration from Mexico and Canada has fallen off.

Mr. SWANSON. I have been informed, though I do not know whether it is true or not, that great colonies are being formed of people coming to those places for the purpose of later coming into the United States; that the steamship companies carry them to those countries and in that way effect really a nullification of our immigration law.

Mr. COLT. So far as I have any opinion, I concede as a matter of precaution that it would be well to extend the time from one year to three or five years. I agree to that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, along the line of the question suggested by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. Husband said in his report in speaking of immigration from Canada and Mexico:

There are plenty of indications, however, that systematic violations on a considerable scale will be attempted during the remainder of the present fiscal year, or, in any event, during the coming fiscal year, provided the law is continued in force. I shall not go into details in this regard but can assure you that the bureau is quite fully aware of the situation and will employ every possible means to insure a strict enforcement of the law.

Then further over in his report he said:

Various immigrant aid societies and similar organizations, and possibly also steamship agents in foreign countries, have, according to reports believed to be authentic, fostered and promoted this movement of aliens to foreign contiguous and neighboring countries. It is known that thousands of aliens from countries with exhausted quotas have entered Mexico in recent months; that there are perhaps a larger number of such aliens now in Cuba, with no employment and no prospect of securing same, and that others have gone to Canada and to South America (principally to Brazil), all apparently with the one purpose in view of eventually gaining admission to the United States.

With a situation such as that confronting us, does anyone tell me we should not amend the law when the joint resolution is here for consideration?

Before I was interrupted I was discussing the penalty features as applied to the steamship companies. The amendment suggested in my substitute carries the penalty to the steamship companies which violate the law. There is none in the present law touching the 3 per cent quota provision.

Here is what President Harding had to say about that proposition. Now, you Republicans will all prick up your ears and listen to this, I know. I wish to ask unanimous consent to incorporate, following my remarks, this very remarkable document on immigration and the 3 per cent restriction law by Robert De C. Ward, professor at Harvard University.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Appendix B.)

Mr. HARRISON. President Harding replied to a letter written by Representative ISAAC SIEGEL, of New York, in September, 1921, and, among other things, said:

I haven't any doubt in the world but the enforcement of the immigration laws is working many a hardship. My own distress has been very great over some of the specific instances which have been reported to me. If I have the situation correctly presented, the difficulty must be charged to the dishonest steamship agents who have brought to this country innocent immigrants in spite of our continued warnings during a period of very great leniency. I know how very persistent have been the impositions which have been made on the Government agents who have been disposed to be sympathetic and more than generous in carrying out the law.

Here is what the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, says about the steamship companies bringing over undesirable immigrants in violation of the regulations:

Secretary Davis reiterated the statement by the President that much of the trouble is caused by dishonest steamship agents and that pitiful stories of hardship are being circulated in the deliberate attempt to discredit the law.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning, on September 3, said:

Unfortunately, the law has no teeth, and the only way the offending companies can be punished is to compel them to take back aliens who are not admissible.

It is a pitiful sight. I have never seen it, but I have heard of it. I know it must appeal to the sensibilities of men and women everywhere that poor, unfortunates brought here by steamship companies from Europe and elsewhere and landed at New York



without money, without friends, are sent back home because the quota of immigrants permitted to come is exhausted. If the human heart could be touched, that sight would touch it.

The coming here of people under such conditions through the influence of steamship companies should be prevented. We shall never be able to stop it so long as we have no law which penalizes the agents of steamship companies for bringing over these unfortunates under such circumstances, and yet the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Ohio say we have not the time to amend the existing law, that the date of expiration of the present law is the 30th of June, and we may not be able to enact a new law by that time. I am not surprised at Senators on the other side making such a statement and believing in it, because they realize that they have taken so long to do nothing in relation to all other matters.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Mississippi is giving a perfect illustration of the reason why it is necessary to pass this joint resolution by the time he is wasting instead of trying to amend the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, if the Senator from Massachusetts will not listen to argument and Senators on the other side merely wish to sit here and say, "No; we have not time for that," well and good; but such action furnishes the reason why the Republican leadership is now being denounced from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to listen to argument when argument is made.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has agreed with me on two or three propositions which I have advanced.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly. I want to help get the joint resolution through.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts vote for my substitute for the joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not think the Senator would.

Mr. LODGE. But I will vote for some amendments if the Senator from Mississippi will frame them properly.

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped that the Senator occasionally would vote for something that is right. I am offering a good proposition, and yet the Senator will not take it.

Mr. LODGE. I am ready to vote for any amendment which I believe should be made; I do not know that there is anything in the Senator's substitute to which I object; but I know there are certain amendments that ought to be made to the pending joint resolution, and it will not be done by standing here and bellowing about the Republican Party. The thing to do is to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution and perfect it.

Mr. HARRISON. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts when he is hit is bound to rise. God knows I have been, and other Senators on this side have been, very lenient with the Republican Party—more so than we should have been.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Mississippi does not need to be lenient. He does not do the Republican Party the slightest harm.

Mr. HARRISON. I know that. One can not do any harm to a thing which is dead, for it does not feel.

Mr. LODGE. The Republican Party has enough feeling to win in the next election.

Mr. HARRISON. That is what I call optimism of the rarest kind.

Mr. LODGE. Not a bit. I remember that the Senator from Mississippi was optimistic in 1920; and so I doubt if there is any foundation for his present optimism.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the Senator's party stacked the cards and played them from under the table on us at that time.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, I thought that the business before the Senate was the joint resolution proposing to extend the existing immigration law. I desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that I should like to see the joint resolution perfected along the line of some of the amendments which have been suggested by Mr. Husband. I have always taken that position; but the reason why I can not vote for the amendment or substitute of the Senator from Mississippi is that he includes some of the commissioner general's amendments and rejects others, these amendments all being included in the committee print, which is the basis of the Senator's amendment or substitute.

I wish to call attention to one of the amendments the adoption of which Mr. Husband could not recommend in its present form. I refer to the amendment which requires cooperation of the Department of State with the Department of Labor. It is an amendment along the line of constructive legislation, along the line of selection at the source. The amendment is to the effect that when the consul visés a passport he shall also issue a certificate that the alien comes within the quota. The consul having the quota before him will know the number of immigrants that may be admitted from that particular country, and he will issue a certificate to the alien immigrant applicant. That amendment has not been perfected; the Secretary of State has not consented to it. That was one of the difficulties which the committee met when it came to constructive legislation. We could not frame such legislation hastily, for it involved a redrafting of the certificate provision.

The committee were met at once with the question, "What are we going to do with the excepted classes under the 3 per cent limitation? Is the consul going to pass upon those?" In other words, there were practical difficulties which had not been solved in connection with the certificate plan, and there has been no agreement as yet by the Secretary of State to cooperate with the Department of Labor. That is one of his amendments that Mr. Husband did not ask the committee to adopt.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARRISON. I shall yield in one moment. Mr. Husband did recommend the adoption of that amendment; he dictated it himself, and said that if some plan like that were not incorporated the department would be very much embarrassed.

Mr. COLT. I beg the Senator's pardon. I know the Senator from Mississippi never intends to make a misstatement and I certainly do not. I think I made the statement a little too strong. Mr. Husband did recommend a certificate provision, but, to speak in somewhat ordinary language, he "passed the buck" to the committee and asked the committee to perfect the amendment and to get the consent of the Secretary of State.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, the committee also passed the buck.

Mr. COLT. He said that was as far as he would go. As to many of the other amendments which he suggested, I approve of them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. In regard to the suggestion as to consular inspection, I think that is a very old idea and a very good one. We tried to get it adopted some 25 years ago, but the difficulty which then met us was that other countries would not permit it. The trouble is not with our own State Department, but other countries will not allow an American consul to say whether or not a citizen of Germany, for instance, or France or whatever country may be affected, shall sail from that country. They objected to our consuls exercising that authority.

Now, under the changed conditions since the Great War, it may be possible to make some arrangement of that kind, and I see no objection to giving the authority to our Government to endeavor to make such an arrangement, but it is not something which we can accomplish ourselves; it is necessary to have some arrangement with foreign governments in order that our consuls may be allowed to issue certificates. It would be the most valuable thing that could be done, if we could once bring it about, but it has been prevented by the action of other countries. I remember in past days Germany particularly objected very strongly.

Mr. HARRISON. The Bureau of Immigration, as I understand, fear that the State Department in the future might abolish the passport system in some particulars. They are, of course, using that system now; but, if it should be abolished, the Bureau of Immigration are afraid that a very undesirable class of immigrants may be admitted to our shores. There would in that event be no examination or certification by our consuls or agents abroad.

Mr. LODGE. We can maintain the passport system.

Mr. HARRISON. We can do it, unless the State Department decides otherwise.

Mr. LODGE. We are now maintaining it.

Mr. HARRISON. We are now maintaining it; but, as I have said, the Bureau of Immigration are fearful that a change may be made. That is according to the statement made to me by Mr. Husband.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, provision concerning the passport system is carried in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and there has been no suggestion from the State Department of abolishing the system.



Mr. HARRISON. That is a matter which may be worked out in conference, but what I have stated was the suggestion of Mr. Husband. If there is objection to that particular provision, it is easy to strike it from the proposed substitute, and then if the other provisions of the substitute which are recommended are all right we could reach an agreement. I assume that no one is combating the suggestion that there should be a penalty on the steamship companies.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I also assume that no one is combating the suggestion that the one-year limitation as to residence in Canada, Mexico, and Cuba should be raised to three years or five years.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think there is.

Mr. HARRISON. So if that be true there should be no great difficulty in reaching an agreement. The other suggestions which I have made are merely to provide some slight administrative changes. For instance, under the present law students who come from a foreign country can not be admitted here merely to attend college. The commissioner thinks that they should be excepted, so that they may come to this country to attend college. Those are small matters. The two main propositions suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration are a penalty on the steamship company and a greater limitation on residence in contiguous territory. If we could agree on those two suggestions, it would be easy to pass this joint resolution, and we would then really enact legislation of a constructive character. If I thought that the House would dillydally about such amendments and would not accept them, and that they would delay the bill beyond the 30th of June, I would be the last Senator here to offer such an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator will admit that it would be a great misfortune to have the bill fail.

Mr. HARRISON. I think it would; but, in view of the fact that practically everybody seems to agree that the two proposals are all right, they could be put in.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say there are two main propositions?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; there are but two main propositions.

Mr. COLT. What are those two?

Mr. HARRISON. The two which I have named. I am perfectly willing to leave out everything else, except the amendment raising the one year's residence requirement in Canada, Cuba, and Mexico and other contiguous territory to five years—that is one—

Mr. LODGE. That ought to be done.

Mr. HARRISON. The other is the imposition of a penalty on steamship companies for violating the rules and regulations and bringing here immigrants from countries the quota of which have been exhausted.

Mr. LODGE. And that ought to be done.

Mr. HARRISON. That should be done.

Mr. LODGE. It is absurd to deport an immigrant and compel a steamship company to take him back for one violation of the immigration laws and not compel it to take him back for another.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators that I have an amendment covering the suggestion in regard to residence in contiguous territory, amending the present law so as to require five years' residence.

Mr. HARRISON. I am perfectly willing to agree on any proposal of that kind.

Mr. STERLING. I suppose the regular order would be to perfect the joint resolution before the Senator's substitute comes up for consideration.

Mr. HARRISON. Perfecting amendments, of course, should first be offered to the joint resolution.

Mr. STERLING. By the amendment to which I have referred and some other amendments, the objections which the Senator from Mississippi has to the joint resolution might be met.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi whether his substitute in any wise deals with subdivision 5, section 2, of the present law which provides that excepted classes as defined therein embrace "aliens from countries emigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration"? Does the Senator's suggested substitute in any wise touch that provision?

Mr. HARRISON. It does not change that at all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I assume the Senator knows how important that provision is.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the effort has been made to take care of that situation, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The provision to which the Senator from California refers is left entirely unchanged.

Mr. HARRISON. I certainly do not propose to change it in my substitute at all, and I do not think that it is changed by the joint resolution at all.

Mr. COLT. May I ask the Senator if he would accept the amendment relating to penalizing the steamship companies as drawn up by Mr. Husband, and also the amendment requiring five years' residence in Canada and Mexico?

Mr. HARRISON. I am perfectly agreeable to adopt the amendments in that form even, but I think they should change, for instance, the 20 per cent monthly limitation under the present law. That is suggested by him as quite desirable. I do not think, however, it is so important that that be done.

Mr. COLT. I will tell the Senator why it is not necessary. It is because the law says "shall not exceed 20 per cent," so that the department could regulate that.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator thinks that other suggestions of the commissioner can wait, then, that is perfectly agreeable to me; but I do think it is highly important and, indeed, necessary that the two amendments to the present law which I have suggested be now adopted—one respecting the time of residence in contiguous territory and the other penalizing steamship companies for violations of the law.

Mr. COLT. I might say to the Senator in regard to the amendments which the commissioner general wanted, that the two which the Senator has suggested do not increase the number of immigrants in any way.

#### APPENDIX A.

Report to the Secretary of Labor by Lillian Russell Moore on European emigration conditions as affecting the United States.

MARCH 28, 1922.

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,

Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I beg leave to submit the following report of my observations on immigration, as commissioned by you, during a visit to European countries:

Immigration, in my opinion, is the gravest question to-day confronting the American people and the most serious problem demanding solution by the American Government.

Time was when our shores were a haven for the politically and religiously oppressed, and when our gates opened the way to opportunity for the ambitious and aspiring of other lands. Time was, too, when our Nation, in its period of construction and reconstruction, needed the brawn of the sturdy European to extend civilization into uncultivated and undeveloped territory.

To-day European conditions are such that a haven of refuge is not required. There is no longer political oppression abroad. Men are not being driven from their homes for disputing the divine right of Kings to rule. The war has restored human rights to the peoples of Europe, and the new conditions permit to all free expression of thought and peaceful possession of property. There may be suffering; there is depression; but there is freedom, and none need seek sanctuary here.

Nor does America need labor to aid in the development of its resources. That stage has long passed, and it is a fact that the immigration of recent years has been from that class of people which arrests, rather than aids, the development of any nation. When I declare that most of those now seeking to come here have not any of the inspiration or the necessity of the early settlers from abroad, I am stating facts that impress everybody who makes any study of European conditions.

In this immigration problem, then, there is only one thing that demands serious attention, and that is, What is best for America?

We must be just before we are generous.

We must think of the future as well as of the present.

The higher civilizations of past ages, history teaches us, succumbed to such foreign invasions as now threaten us.

Alien infiltration wrecked Rome and Greece.

It is against such a fate that America must protect itself—that the American Government must protect its people, including those of foreign birth or extraction who have loyally taken up the duties of American citizenship.

I believe it would be a good thing for America if an immigration "holiday" of five years could be declared. But if we must keep our gates open, I would urge a new system by which the sifting process should be carried on abroad, so that none but those who, physically and mentally, would make valuable additions to our population would be admitted to board ship for America.

There should be rigid tests of mental qualifications by American consuls. One rigid requirement should be that applicants must be able to read, write, and speak their own language.

Physical tests should be conducted by American physicians, and any bodily weakness should mean rejection. The Wassermann blood test ought to be employed in every case.

I am insistent upon the employment of American physicians to make these tests, because I believe that racial sympathies might lead to too liberal a view of bodily infirmities. It is just possible, too, that some foreign government agencies might not object too severely to the departure of undesirables. It has been intimated that foreign governments might protest against the employment of American physicians as health examiners, but there is no logical ground for such objection. Protest might just as reasonably be made against the quarantine officials of home ports who examine incoming passengers.

If the present law restricting immigration by quotas from other countries is continued, it should be materially strengthened as I have suggested. There should be also a central headquarters, possibly in London, where American consuls should regularly report the number of their visés, so that the quota could not be exceeded any month, thus avoiding the hardship of deportation for the excess immigrants.



In present circumstances every intending immigrant needs simply to apply at the nearest American consulate for a visé, for which he pays \$10. It is the consul's duty to ascertain all the facts in relation to the individual, including details respecting health, morals, contract labor, and the like—but the consul is absolutely limited as present conditions exist. He has no power to refuse a visé for any reason other than that the quota of the country is exhausted, and in which event alone he may refuse a visé. This is unfortunate, for it necessarily leads to thousands of departures of unfit persons to America, who succeed either by influence or trickery in entering the country and being turned back upon inspection at Ellis Island.

These people lose by breaking up their homes in their own countries, and America loses by the cost of their return. Much human misery could be avoided, periodical congestion at Ellis Island prevented, and the entrance of unfit persons into the United States most conveniently checked by the application of the following suggestions:

Consuls should be authorized to refuse visés to all unfit persons. All applicants for visés in the case of immigrant persons should be required to submit details three months before final action is taken. This should include a certificate from their native doctor stating that a blood test has been taken, thus proving they are physically fit. In case of male immigrants, a penal certificate should be presented giving a record of their career, on which is attached a photograph of each man, thus allowing the consul to obtain close information of the most definite character with regard to the alien's past history, physical condition, qualifications as farmer, laboring man, etc.

Questioning of the immigrants has not proven satisfactory. It is quite obvious that an applicant is not likely to admit anything to a consular officer which will damage his chances of obtaining a visé. Therefore, as I suggested, the penal certificate, accompanied by a photograph of each man, would give a direct line upon his record. It would also be advisable to have the Bureaus of Immigration and Naturalization subject every foreigner living in the United States who wishes to bring over an immigrant to the same examination as the immigrant himself must pass before a consular officer. Such a foreign resident should be required to submit a police record covering the entire time of his residence in the United States, and an affidavit of support executed by the relative in the United States should be demanded of every applicant. And after this affidavit has been executed, and before it is sent abroad to the immigrant, it should be stamped by the immigration authorities, so that when it is presented to a consular officer, with a request for a visé, he will know that the immigrant intends to join a decent, law-abiding resident of the United States.

There should be additional laws making it a felony for any resident of the United States making a false statement concerning the admissibility of any relative or other immigrant. This law should be so drastic that it will seal up one of the most intolerable loopholes in our immigration system.

A change in the immigration law from the legal 3 per cent quota would perhaps be advisable to read instead that the number of immigrants to be allowed in the United States should be agreed upon by the Secretary of Labor and foreign countries, establishing the number of passports to be issued for three months in advance, and that the total quota of 3 per cent of all countries, added together, shall not be surpassed. This would give the Secretary of Labor the power to choose such countries as he thinks have the most desirable immigrants for the United States. And instead of the steamship lines all depositing their immigrants at Ellis Island license could be given for disembarkation of immigrants at such ports as New York, Boston, Baltimore, Savannah, New Orleans, Galveston, San Francisco, and Seattle. With our own merchant marine this could easily be done. This would scatter the immigration throughout the country, place the farmers in the farming countries, and relieve New York from increasing its present foreign population.

This system would likewise put a stop to clandestine immigration. The newspapers in Italy publish, after the sailing of practically every steamer for the United States, that a number of clandestine immigrants have been found hidden on board and were arrested, and in almost every case they were criminals.

While I was in Rome the steamer *Arabic* sailed from Naples, and advice came from the Italian authorities by wireless that there were 100 clandestine immigrants on board. These men pay large sums of money to be smuggled on the steamer, and if they succeed in reaching New York disembark as members of the crew. It is therefore advisable that all the crew of any steamer sailing for a United States port should have a proper book or certificate, with their photograph on it for identification, and stating that they are one of the crew of the steamer, and should not be allowed to disembark and pass through the customs gate without showing such card or certificate.

In this manner these undesirables would be unable to land. At present many are taken from alongside in small boats and carried to some convenient landing place.

When I arrived in Cherbourg I was met by the doctor in charge of the immigrants. He gave me the inclosed certificate, which shows that he vaccinated 200 immigrants bound for America, out of which 21 proved to have fatal diseases, which would compel them to be turned back upon their arrival at Ellis Island. Neither the examining doctor, the consul who viséed their passports, nor the consul general at Cherbourg were endowed with the power to forbid them to go aboard the steamer. It seems to me that this is the foundation of all the trouble. And it takes but a small mind to realize that if more power is not invested in our consuls abroad and if every immigrant is not compelled to have a blood-test certificate at the very beginning of his intentions to come to America as an immigrant, our civilization of the future will deteriorate to a marvelous extent.

I further believe that all of the personal information of each man gathered by the consuls and immigration inspectors should be available to examining judges before certificates of naturalization are granted. We are menaced, and we must avoid that condition. Take the consul at Vienna, for instance:

During the years of 1920 and 1921, long before office hours, crowds of unwashed, ill-fed, prospective immigrants—most of them of very low mentality and moral fiber—surged around the consulate. These people were from Poland, Russia, or Rumania, and claimed to have blood relatives in America who would take care of them and guarantee them support. They did not know the meaning of the word "truthfulness," and were carriers of disease caused by their extreme bodily filth. It was discovered that large numbers of Poles were applying for visés at Vienna, claiming the necessary one year's residence in the place of departure, and bringing with them documents to prove such residence. So many of these documents were false that the practice was adopted throughout the year 1921 of having every Sienna document—including the police certificate of morality required—which was pre-

sented by a Pole examined and checked by the investigator. It was found that underground channels of information existed among these people as how to have false documents prepared by meeting certain "agents" in given "café houses." Other means of pressure were brought to bear on consular officers. In these cases lawyers would appear as intermediaries or friends from the United States. Usually naturalized American citizens would appear as spokesmen. These often proved to be promoters of immigration, who would obtain in New York the names of persons wishing their so-called relatives to come over, and who, for the consideration of usually more than a hundred dollars in each case, would fill out a large list of names and undertake to go to eastern Europe to "see them through" all visé and traveling formalities. In one case a New York notary public, who had obtained names of people coming to him professionally to make out affidavits, undertook to bring over 50 immigrants, whom he declared to be his relatives, and who all claimed a year's residence in Austria. An investigation proved that they all had false documents and that they had been in Austria only a few days. One of them divulged the fact that the intermediary was to receive \$300 apiece upon their arrival in the United States.

Of the several thousand Polish immigrants who obtained visés in Vienna in the years 1920-21 it was the personal observation of a consular officer stationed there that only two were not bound for New York City, and just one claimed to be a farmer—all nonproductive, so-called citizens.

There are several organizations formed for helping certain elements which undoubtedly have a considerable humanitarian value, but which, at the same time, have encouraged this kind of immigration. One relief representative assured me that they had a great amount of money in the banks of Europe which was to be used to help immigrants to get to America.

From Italy we get a more productive immigrant. While some of them come to us as truck gardeners, the greater number go into railroad, excavating, and mine work. The majority of immigrants from southern Italy and Sicily are of the peasant type. Their standards of living are low. Their ultimate destinations are the industrial towns of the East. As potential American citizens they afford reasons for considerable apprehension. From Naples come farm laborers, and their physical condition is generally good. From Florence, Venice, Milan, and Genoa the immigrant is productive, as many of them are stone-masons, carpenters, miners, mechanics, braziers, etc. From Trieste the great majority, and practically all of those who obtain visés from this quarter, are of the Slav nationality. The opinion from that consular district maintains that, in spite of the present system of control, it is almost impossible to prevent agitators, criminals, and other dangerous undesirables from obtaining visés, and the local authorities do not desire to cooperate to the extent of furnishing the names of persons under suspicion.

We have laws and regulations of a most painstaking character which prevent the shipment of live stock, living plants, and seeds to the United States, and we prohibit entirely shipments under these heads instantly when danger arises; but until the last few months we have opened our national gates to human beings desiring to settle among us without much restriction as to moral consideration or purity of blood. And as a result we have a huge problem with which to deal. It would be a wonderful thing if all immigration could take a rest for a few years, for the adjustment and reconstruction of its principles and regulations, and meantime requesting our Congressmen to visit the countries from which the majority of immigrants come. They could do this in their vacation months—not as a pleasure trip, but as a matter of information, which can be used to the greatest advantage in future discriminating rules for immigration, that we may protect ourselves permanently by a drastic prohibition as respects the unfit, as described in section 3 of the present immigration law.

If Congressmen should go abroad they could see the facts as I saw them. One particular fact is that no good immigration is turning our way. The good inhabitants of every foreign country are needed there, and can possibly be happier and more contented there than in America.

It is a fact that in France there are only 65,000 in the ranks of the unemployed. Reconstruction is being elaborately carried on in France, and every able-bodied man is not only needed but his prospects are made so alluring that he has no inclination to emigrate. Only those who are useless to France and would be a burden to America show any tendency to depart. Italy needs men to till the soil, to grow food, and to keep her own country prosperous. It is to the interest of France and Italy to keep the best of their sons at home—if not forever, at least for a long time to come.

There is more to this immigration problem than the economic side. Warning has been issued through the German Red Cross that the United States must be on its guard against the introduction of cholera and typhus by Russian immigrants. Hordes of these people, Dr. A. Schlesinger officially announced, are pouring into Germany over the Polish, Latvian, and Estonian borders, and many are seeking passports to America, where they have relatives and friends who are financing them for the journey.

Already nearly 50,000 cases exist in Germany, traced to refugees, and German immigrants from the Volga region have been infected. Seventy-five per cent of the recent arrivals in the concentration camps were diseased, according to Red Cross statistics.

The minister of health has called attention to the necessity of vaccinating everyone arriving from Russia, declaring that children especially are carriers of typhus.

We take in too few productive immigrants and too many destructive. I look upon the question of immigration as closely associated with that of citizenship. Personally, I believe that no alien should be naturalized until he has lived in the United States 21 years. Our own men have to live here 21 years before they can become voting citizens.

It is fortunate for the United States that Congress enacted the 3 per cent quota law. It is doing much good. With some of the additions I have suggested, it would be quite efficient. Its chief weakness is the lack of power held by our consuls abroad. There, it seems to me, is the foundation of all of the trouble.

I want to say for our American consuls that I never met a more patriotic class of men as a rule. Their Americanism is pronounced, and I believe it is accentuated by their knowledge of America's peril. They see, and they know, better than any class of our citizens, the difficulties and dangers of laxity in immigration laws.

Our America has passed the transition stage.

It is to-day a world power.

An intelligent, cohesive, loyal citizenship is its propulsive force. Solidification of all its elements is essential to perpetuity.

The melting pot has been overcrowded. It has boiled too quickly and is running over.



It were better to put out the fires under it and allow its contents to solidify before adding any more raw material.  
If we don't keep up the bars, and make them higher and stronger, there will no longer be an America for Americans.  
Respectfully submitted.

LILLIAN RUSSELL MOORE.

#### APPENDIX B.

(Reprinted, without change of paging, from the Journal of Heredity (organ of the American Genetic Association), Vol. 12, No. 7; Washington, D. C., August-September, 1921.)

#### IMMIGRATION AND THE 3 PER CENT RESTRICTIVE LAW.

[Robert De C. Ward, Harvard University.]

#### THE NEW LAW AND ITS ENACTMENT.

The new 3 per cent immigration restriction act was designed to meet postwar conditions which our previous laws were never intended to cope with. It passed both Houses of Congress by tremendous majorities, and after being "pocket vetoed" by President Wilson was again passed by similarly large majorities and promptly approved by President Harding. The backbone of the new law is as follows: Section 2. "That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910." Eight classes of aliens are excepted from this provision, including "(8) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States." Provision is made for the determination of the exact numbers of aliens of the different nationalities who may be admitted. The number of any nationality that may be admitted in any one month shall not exceed 20 per cent of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year. Preference shall be given, "so far as possible," to wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées of citizens of those who have applied for citizenship, and of persons eligible for citizenship who were in the service of the United States during the war and were honorably discharged. Provision is further made for the preparation of rules and regulations necessary to carry the act into effect and for the publication of statements showing the exact numbers who may be admitted. The act continues in force until June 30, 1922.

#### THE REASONS FOR THE NEW LAW.

The enormous majorities by which Congress passed this bill clearly reflected the firm conviction of the great mass of our people that immediate and effective restriction was imperative. There has never been a time in the history of immigration legislation when the popular demand was so widespread and so vehement. The practically unanimous opinion of Government immigration officials and of all unprejudiced experts was that immigration was certain to increase, and increase rapidly, to numbers greatly exceeding those of prewar days, and that the quality of the bulk of the newcomers would be distinctly inferior. Very important testimony along these lines was received from United States consular officers at numerous foreign ports and submitted by the Department of State to Congress. These reports, coming from many different men and many different places, are distinctly to be regarded as unprejudiced and authoritative. They practically all agree in certifying that the majority of the prospective immigrants are both physically and mentally undesirable. Such expressions as "physically deficient," "mentally deficient," "economically undesirable," "socially undesirable," "of low standards of living," "not of the most desirable class" occur again and again. Furthermore, numerous competent and unprejudiced observers who had been making a first-hand study of the conditions in Europe fully concurred in the views expressed by our own consular officers.

The predictions made by these various competent authorities have been fully verified. Immigration during the year ending June 30, 1921, exceeded 800,000, almost doubling that of the preceding year. Furthermore, the opinion of those who have had opportunity to observe the new arrivals, and who are unprejudiced and honest in their views, is to the effect that our consular officers and our experts were fully justified in their statements regarding the inferior quality of most, not all, of these people. An immigration official at New York has recently reported that the majority of the aliens now coming in expect to be fruit peddlers, shoe blacks, soft-drink vendors, and sweatshop workers. (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1921.)

#### THE OPPOSITION TO RESTRICTION.

In spite of the extraordinary popular demand for restriction in accordance with which Congress acted, there was insidious, active opposition, thoroughly organized, heavily financed, issuing misleading information, playing upon all sorts of alien prejudices, endeavoring by every possible means to counteract the plain will of the vast majority of the American people. One of the best known and most reliable Washington newspaper correspondents, Mr. Mark Sullivan, writing of the hearings before the House Committee on Immigration February 7, 1921, said:

"The great bulk of the hearings consisted of testimony from special interests, either racial or business, who opposed the bill strenuously. No thoughtful American, equipped with knowledge of the background, can read the stenographic report of those hearings without being deeply and soberly concerned."

Still more striking is the evidence brought forward by Hon. JOHN C. BOX, of Texas, in the House of Representatives January 8, 1921. Judge Box said:

"Mr. Chairman, recently by a vote of 295 to 41 a bill suspending immigration was passed by this House, in which vote the will of the American people spoke and party lines disappeared. But powerful influences oppose restriction. Two of these are:

"First. A demand by the foreign born among us that their kinspeople and racial comrades be admitted freely.

"Second. Individual and corporate greed which disregards the present and future welfare of the mass of Americans and their children because it wants money and power over labor.

"The interracial council is a mouthpiece of the opposition of these two groups. To it I invite your attention."

"The interracial council is a concern of some magnitude. Some months ago it had 40 or 50 executives and other full-time paid employees in its offices in New York, and an unascertained number of other agents and employees. It is financed, in part at least, by its industrial or subscribing members, numbering several hundred. The following are some of its subscribing members whose names I get from its printed literature and from the testimony of Mr. Mayer, its executive secretary:

"Phelps Bros. & Co., 'owners of an Italian steamship line'; the International Mercantile Marine Co.; Barber Steamship Lines; Cosmopolitan Shipping Co.; Downey Shipbuilding Corporation; France & Canada Steamship Co.; Green Star Steamship Co.; Pacat Steamship Co.; Pacific Steamship Co.; Todd Ship Yards Corporation; Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Allegheny Steel Co.; American Beet Sugar Co.; American Locomotive Co.; American Woolen Co.; Armour & Co.; Atlas Powder Co.; Chattanooga Coke & Gas Co.; Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co.; Henderson Shipbuilding Co.; Hillman Coal & Coke Co.; Indiana Pipe Line Co.; Inland Steel Co.; Kelley-Springfield Tire Co.; Lackawanna Steel Co.; National Sugar Refining Co.; National Shipping Co.; New Home Sewing Machine Co.; Oliver Iron & Steel Co.; Pennsylvania Coal Co.; Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; Pennsylvania Textile Co.; Phelps-Dodge Corporation; Southern Cotton Oil Co.; Standard Steel Car Co.; Studebaker Corporation; Underwood Typewriter Co.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Co.; Bethlehem Steel Co.; Cudahy Packing Co.; Dold Packing Co.; Du Pont de Nemours & Co.; General Motors Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Swift & Co.

"These are only a few of the several hundred big financial, industrial, and steamship concerns whose money is financing the propaganda of the interracial council. It will be noted that many steamship companies are among them. One list of these subscribing or industrial members will be found in the committee hearings of April 22, 1920; another list, containing some names not given in the testimony, will be found printed on the literature of the interracial council.

"These subscribing members pay annual membership fees amounting to as much as \$2,500 for some concerns, and more than that for a few, and smaller sums for each of many others. It runs from \$100 a year to \$2,500 as an average. A few are larger." (Testimony of Mayer, executive secretary, p. 167.)

"The expenditures of the interracial council in certain of its activities, which manifestly do not cover all of them, amounted to \$213,955.19 for the period beginning March 1, 1919, and ending March 31, 1920. (See testimony, Mayer, p. 167.) That was the first year of its existence. Its activities have continued with apparently increased magnitude, but I am without information as to later expenditures.

"Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BOX. Yes.

"Mr. BLANTON. Is it any wonder, then, that this splendid piece of legislation has been sidetracked and held up?

"Mr. BOX. It is not any wonder; but it is an ominous thing if the will of the American people is to have to give way to influences like these. Nothing but a sense of duty prompts me to present these facts as they have been disclosed. The statement that I have made is based upon testimony. I have the hearings."

The situation is perfectly clear. Further comment on this point is unnecessary.

#### THE WORKING OF THE LAW.

It was natural that there would be certain difficulties in the early working of the new law before the exact numbers of admissible aliens from each country could be officially determined. Numerous steamers arrived during the early part of June with aliens far in excess of the numbers which were admissible. Congestion resulted. To each port there had been assigned a percentage based on the usual percentage entering that port. When these numbers had been filled efforts were made to borrow from other ports "rights" to land additional immigrants. There was great confusion. Immigration officials in Washington went to the limit in showing humanity and consideration. Aliens in excess of the June quota were allowed to land under bonds. By joint resolution Congress later provided that the excess numbers of any nationality thus admitted should be deducted from the totals of that nationality admissible during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1921.

But even in the early days of the new law, and all the more since then, the complications and the hardships to incoming aliens have been chiefly due to the disregard of the law by the steamship companies. In the whole history of our immigration legislation these companies, with rare exceptions, and then usually only when infractions of the law meant payment of fines, have never tried to obey our laws. Their tactics under the new percentage limitation act have been as usual.

The percentage bill was before Congress in one form or another during most of last winter. There never was any doubt that it would become law before summer. Although the exact number of aliens of each nationality could not be officially determined at the moment of the enactment of the measure, the steamship companies had ample time to make plans to meet the new conditions. They were in no sense "caught," as one editor has expressed it. The logical and the humane policy on their part would have been to refuse passage to all aliens who might, when the exact percentages of admissible immigrants were announced, be refused permission to land. But these companies accepted as steerage passengers several thousands of aliens who would, beyond a doubt, be excludable. There is little doubt that these excess aliens were shipped with the conviction that the sympathies of "sentimentalists" and of certain Congressmen who are interested in the "foreign vote" would be so aroused that some special provision would be made for the landing of the excess numbers. The steamship companies deserve absolutely no sympathy. They accepted the passage money of thousands of aliens who should never have been allowed to embark. They have no interest in their steerage passengers beyond the receipt of their passage money. The Commissioner General of Immigration said in Washington on June 10 last that there were then more than 10,000 immigrants in excess of the June quota already on their way to the United States, and all were accepted for passage after the new law had gone into effect.

The monthly "immigrant derby," when, during the last few minutes of each month, incoming steamships race from beyond the 3-mile limit to quarantine in the effort to land their steerage passengers in time to have them come within the quota, and the numerous cases of hardship when the excess aliens have to be debarked could be avoided if all the steamship companies were honestly endeavoring to live up to the law. The trans-Atlantic steamship lines have a system of daily exchange of information as to the numbers of alien passengers who are embarking on their several ships. No excess over the allotted quota need therefore be started on the voyage.

Although practically all of the difficulties and the hardships to debarked aliens were due to the flagrant disregard of the law on the part of the steamship companies, the administration very properly felt that everything possible should be done to save needless suffering of perfectly innocent aliens. Hence, about mid-September, the State Department sent instructions to American consular officers abroad not to visé passports from any country whose annual admission quota to the United States is approaching exhaustion, or has already been exhausted.



This should do a great deal to reduce the number of cases of hardship and of disappointment for which, be it reiterated, the steamship companies, not the laws, are chiefly responsible.

#### PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE NEW LAW.

Even before the new law went into effect, a very active press campaign against it was begun. The law has been subjected to an organized attack by "interested" individuals, alien racial groups and hyphenated societies, and certain influential newspapers. All of these are bent on making any percentage limitation scheme appear unreasonable, unjust, and inhumane. All of them are, fundamentally, opposed to any action on the part of the American Government to protect our country against practically unrestricted and unselected immigration. In the case of influential newspapers which are incessantly attacking the new law, it may incidentally be noted that they all carry heavy steamship advertising. In the case of other papers also, the motive is plainly that of the pocketbook. Thus, the bulletin of the Associated General Contractors has said that the effect of the law will be to "prevent the immigration to this country of the most useful class of immigrants—the common laborers who come here to work in the construction industry." The "influences" against restriction have also been very busy in Washington, interviewing Senators and Congressmen, attacking not only the percentage limitation measure but also all restrictive legislation.

The propaganda against the new restriction law has not been confined to this country. In a dispatch to the Philadelphia Public Ledger, dated London, October 16, 1921, the following statements were made:

"European steamship companies, the traditional enemies of United States immigration restrictions, have started propaganda aiming at the breaking down of the barriers put up by the '3 per cent' law. They hope when the present temporary measure expires next June to have so prepared the ground that again they will be in a position to fill the holds of their ships with Europe's surplus humanity and pour it into the United States. This law which limits the number of immigrants to a very small proportion of the number allowed to enter the United States heretofore was a severe blow to the steamship lines, and they fought it hard when it was before Congress. In the days before the war steamships carried thousands of immigrants, at approximately \$100 a head, whereas now they carry dozens. The loss of that revenue came at a time when the trans-Atlantic passenger business was less remunerative than for years, because of the high costs of operating ships."

"To get back some of this business the big companies have outlined a plan for a campaign of propaganda, and already have got it working in England. The plans rest on the idea of digging up specific cases of alleged improper treatment of foreigners at Ellis Island and spreading them broadcast in the European press."

The attitude of the steamship companies and of the other influences which are seeking to bring the new law into disrepute has been clearly set forth by Government officials. Representative ISAAC SIEGEL, of New York, wrote to the President in September, 1921, citing instances of cruelty to aliens which had occurred in the enforcement of the law. President Harding replied as follows:

"I haven't any doubt in the world but the enforcement of the immigration laws is working many a hardship. My own distress has been very great over some of the specific instances which have been reported to me. If I have the situation correctly presented, the difficulty must be charged to the dishonest steamship agents, who have brought to this country innocent immigrants in spite of our continued warnings during a period of very great leniency. I know how very persistent have been the impositions which have been made on the Government agents who have been disposed to be sympathetic and more than generous in carrying out the law."

Secretary of Labor Davis reiterated the statement by the President that much of the trouble is caused by dishonest steamship agents, and that pitiful stories of hardship are being circulated in the deliberate attempt to discredit the law. Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning on September 3, 1921, said:

"Unfortunately the law has no teeth, and the only way the offending companies can be punished is to compel them to take back aliens who are not admissible."

That, he added, was being done, the department "having exhausted its milk of human kindness." Mr. Henning here emphasizes the fundamental deficiency in the law. It has no teeth. There is no fine or punishment for the companies which disregard its provisions, nor is the company required to refund the deported alien's passage money. The only way is to compel the companies to carry back at their own expense the surplus, and when this has been done in a few hundreds of cases it is perhaps not too much to hope that these companies will begin to cooperate among themselves. As soon as they do so the law will prove entirely workable.

Finally on September 15 Assistant Secretary Henning added:

"Those in control of the flood of aliens coming into this country deliberately exceed the monthly quotas and depend upon compelling us, with their sob stories and tales of families being separated, to permit the law to be disregarded."

Patriotic Americans, in whose hearts patriotism is above pocketbook, can not give too much praise to President Harding, Secretary Davis, Assistant Secretary Henning, and Commissioner General Husband for their firm stand on this whole question of the enforcement of the law. In the face of aggressive, persistent, and thoroughly organized opposition on the part of selfish interests they have held their ground, tempering the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States with the utmost possible justice and humanity. They deserve well of their country, and they may be assured of the support and high commendation of the vast majority of plain Americans, who are not organized to work for the enforcement of these laws and who seldom take it upon themselves to make their views known to Government officials, either personally or by writing. The highest commendation is also due to the Senators and Representatives who in the face of fierce and bitter opposition, heavily financed and thoroughly organized, secured the passage through Congress of the new act. To Senator DILLINGHAM, of Vermont, and his supporters in the Senate and to Congressman ALBERT JOHNSON, of Washington, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, and his staunch supporters on his committee and in the House the country owes a great debt of gratitude which it will not forget.

#### THE NEW LAW VINDICATED.

The percentage law, in spite of its crudities and of difficulties in its enforcement, has been abundantly vindicated. Immigration was fast assuming its pre-war rate when the new law went into effect. Although it did not begin to function until early in June, the commissioner general estimated that it probably reduced immigration in that one month by about 50,000. As one of the Washington correspondents puts it:

"Incidentally, the sudden appearance of unemployment in America illustrates the wisdom of the act restricting immigration which was

passed during the first few weeks of Harding's administration. Otherwise our unemployment problem might have been greatly increased. Throughout the world great numbers of human beings have been displaced by war and postwar conditions. These derelicts float toward us as inevitably as water flows down hill. There was some degree of truth, although more mere cleverness, in the saying that America was becoming the 'cesspool' of the human race. \* \* \* The new law puts a limit, even if only a loose and partial limit, on the number of immigrants who can increase and complicate our unemployment problem."

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION.

The 3 per cent limitation act expires on June 30, 1922. What shall take its place? The "emergency" which led to its adoption still exists and will continue to exist. There is no longer an "emergency." We are facing a permanent condition of rapidly increasing and of steadily deteriorating immigration. And there are millions of prospective immigrants overseas who are simply waiting for the 30th of June, when they will rush in in a seething, chaotic mob unless Congress takes steps to stop them.

A calm, unprejudiced survey of past legislation and of the workings of the temporary 3 per cent restrictive law leads the writer to the following conclusions regarding the lines along which our new legislation should be planned.

First. The percentage-limitation principle, long and strongly advocated by leading authorities, should be made permanent. Whether this should be the present 3 per cent, based simply on the number of aliens of each nationality in this country, or a somewhat larger percentage, say, 5 per cent or 10 per cent, based on the numbers of each nationality who have become citizens, is relatively immaterial. The latter, on the whole, seems the more consistent and more rational plan.

Second. Heavy fines of at least \$200 should be imposed upon the transportation companies in the case of every alien who is brought here in excess of the quota and in violation of the general immigration laws. Such fines would immediately put an end to most of the cases of hardship and suffering which have occurred during the past few months because the present law has "no teeth." It is a very strong argument in favor of heavy fines that, by this means, we can force the steamship companies, without expense to us and with the minimum of hardship to the intending immigrant, to make a careful examination and count of their passengers on the other side, and thus to prevent the embarkation of all aliens in excess of the quotas and of those who are inadmissible, for any other reason, under our laws.

Third. Every prospective immigrant should have a passport, viséed by an American consul after the alien has been "passed" by an immigration inspector and a medical officer of the United States Public Health Service attached, as vice consuls, to various consular offices abroad. This provision is embodied in a bill introduced by Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, of Washington, on July 16, 1921 (H. R. 7804). Such foreign inspection would obviously be a wise and humane way of stopping most of the inadmissible aliens before they started on their voyage. This plan would be to the advantage of the prospective immigrant, and it would also be better for the steamship companies, for it would mean that very few rejected aliens would have to be taken back at the companies' expense. Canada has for years eliminated her undesirable immigrants "at the source." Passports would not give the alien the right to land if, after a second examination at our own ports, he were found to be inadmissible. Cases of this sort would, however, be rare. Furthermore, the number of passports issued in each foreign country should not exceed the official percentage quota of that country.

Fourth. Some plan of registration of arriving aliens such as that suggested by Secretary Davis might well be inaugurated. This would not in any way constitute the alien a suspected or an undesirable person, but it would help us in our task of Americanization and of exercising a sort of watchful supervision over our new arrivals.

The logical thing to do is to plan our new legislation along existing lines. Experience has shown that these are on the whole wise, sane, and reasonable. Canada, for example, has, in her immigration laws, closely followed our general immigration law, although she has added many additional restrictions. With the changes and additions above suggested, certain perfectly definite results would follow, viz, (1) a reasonable restriction, to something like an assimilable quantity, of the number of immigrants; (2) a far more careful selection, and a more effective elimination of the unfit; (3) a very great reduction in the number of cases of hardship now arising when aliens reach our shores only to be deported.

In the light of all available facts, it would seem in the highest degree unwise, illogical, and dangerous to embark upon any new and untried schemes of immigration legislation such as those of putting almost unlimited discretionary powers in the hands of a commission, of repealing any portion of our general immigration act of 1917, and of superseding the Chinese exclusion act and the "gentlemen's agreement" with Japan by a plan for admitting orientals on any percentage basis.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand the Senator says he has an amendment pertaining to residence in contiguous territory?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I have an amendment proposing to change the present law so as to make the requirement five years.

Mr. HARRISON. We could embody both propositions in one amendment, if that would be agreeable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STERLING. I send the amendment to the desk and offer it if it is in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, after line 6, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

SEC. 2. That subdivision (7) of section 2 (a) of the act of May 19, 1921, entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"(7) Aliens who have resided continuously for at least five years immediately preceding the time of their application for admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central and South America, or adjacent islands."



Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator from South Dakota will not extend his amendment so that it will incorporate section 4, as suggested by the Commissioner General of Immigration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will permit the Chair, he will call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is a pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], which affects the text of the joint resolution, and was offered prior to this one, and should be considered first.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not mean to have this voted on now; but I hoped the Senator would incorporate the two propositions in one.

Mr. STERLING. That I will do, and I offer this as an amendment to follow the one just suggested, found on pages 9 and 10 of the print which I send to the Secretary, beginning with section 4.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Mississippi withdrawn his substitute?

Mr. HARRISON. I am going to withdraw my substitute if the chairman of the committee will accept this other proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the question now is on perfecting this amendment if possible.

Mr. HARRISON. What the Senator from South Dakota has offered is for the purpose of trying to perfect the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute of the Senator from Mississippi is before the Senate. I have a substitute to offer if that is voted down.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say to the Senator from Georgia that I have not yet withdrawn my substitute, but I am going to do so just as soon as the Senator from South Dakota puts in good form his amendment carrying out those two propositions.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that there is the right, of course, to perfect the pending measure.

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand the Senator from Georgia, he is then going to offer a substitute for the proposition.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from South Dakota also proposes to add, as section 3, the following:

SEC. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person, including any transportation company other than railway lines entering the United States from foreign contiguous territory, or the owner, master, agent, or consignee of any vessel, to bring to the United States, either from a foreign country or any insular possession of the United States, any alien not admissible by virtue of the terms of this act, or otherwise in violation of any rule or regulation, not inconsistent with this act, prescribed by the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor; and if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that any alien, not admissible because of the terms of this act, has been so brought, such person or transportation company, or the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any such vessel, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of \$200 for each alien so brought, and in addition a sum equal to that paid by such alien for his transportation from the initial point of departure, indicated in his ticket, to the port of arrival, such latter sum to be delivered by the collector of customs to the alien on whose account assessed. And no vessel shall be granted clearance papers pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine remains unpaid, and such fine shall not be remitted or refunded: *Provided*, That clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. That is an amendment that is offered to this joint resolution. Of course the substitute is more in the form of a bill. There is no difference, as I understand, between a joint resolution and a bill. Both have to receive the signature of the President.

Mr. LODGE. Just the same.

Mr. HARRISON. So it is perfectly permissible for this amendment to be offered to a joint resolution. Now, Mr. President, I withdraw my substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer a substitute for the joint resolution as amended, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution as amended and to insert:

That no alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States from June 30, 1922, until July 1, 1927; but this resolution shall not apply to persons included in clauses 1 to 6, inclusive, and clause 8 of subdivision (a) or in the second proviso of subdivision (d) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to discuss this matter, except to say this:

There are several million unemployed men in this country. There are 750,000 unemployed ex-service men in this country. Every one of these men who come into this country and gets a position takes a job away from an American. The class of men that are coming into this country now are nothing like the class that formerly came; and I believe we ought to prevent any immigration, except such as I have stated in this substitute, and shut them out for five years.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] will not be adopted, for a perfectly practical reason. As the Senator knows, I agree with his general view of this proposition. Personally, I think I should be willing to vote for such a limitation; but it is perfectly evident that if this amendment is adopted we shall get into a situation where we shall get no immigration legislation at all, because the House will not adopt this provision, and the law will expire, and the country then will be exposed to a deluge of immigration.

It seems to me the sensible thing to do is to pass this joint resolution as it has already been amended. That will afford immediate relief. Then I shall join the Senator and other members of the committee in hearings to perfect legislation such as the facts may show to be necessary.

In that connection, Mr. President, because in the course of this debate the attitude of Mr. Husband has been called into question, in that he is represented as saying that all of these amendments that were suggested by him were absolutely necessary, imperatively necessary—

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be that the Senator got that impression from what I said.

Mr. WILLIS. I did.

Mr. HARRISON. If so, I did not want to give that impression. Mr. Husband in the report said that he thought all of these amendments were advisable. He did not say in his written report that any of them were absolutely necessary and imperative; but Mr. Husband did tell me, and it was not confidential at all, that, so far as the one-year residence proposition was concerned, it was, in his opinion, absolutely imperative.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not disagree with the Senator and with the commissioner in that; and for that reason, and to make the position of Mr. Husband clear, I think it would be desirable to print just here in the Record a portion of his statement, appearing on page 9 of this report, giving his views touching these amendments.

I trust that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be voted down at this time, though I favor the principle of it. I think, if it is adopted, it will imperil this whole legislative program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

While the administration of the act of May 19, 1921, has been attended with perplexing difficulties, some of which could not have been foreseen at the beginning, I think it can be said without qualification that the law has proven to be both workable and effective to a somewhat surprising degree. It went into effect, on short notice, at a time when immigration from Europe was rapidly approaching pre-war proportions, and in view of the many interests and influences involved it has seemingly accomplished its purpose, and for the time being at least is operating smoothly.

Of course, the law has been violated, as must be inevitable in the case of any legislation which drastically interferes with the plans and ambitions of human beings, but it can be said advisedly that there have been no wholesale violations, and, in fact, relatively few aliens have entered the country who would have been debarred solely because of the quota law. There are plenty of indications, however, that systematic violations on a considerable scale will be attempted during the remainder of the present fiscal year or, in any event, during the coming fiscal year, provided the law is continued in force. I shall not go into details in this regard but can assure you that the bureau is quite fully aware of the situation and will employ every possible means to insure a strict enforcement of the law.

#### SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

If the act of May 19, 1921, is to be amended, it is desirable from an administrative standpoint that the following provisions shall be made:

1. Limit the number who may be admitted in any month to 10 per cent of the yearly quota instead of 20 per cent, as in the present law.
2. If possible, the number admitted monthly or annually ought to be regulated at ports of departure rather than at ports of arrival, or preferably in countries of origin, if this can be accomplished through limiting the number of visas issued each month.
3. A sufficient penalty for violations of the act to insure observance on the part of transportation lines.
4. Increasing materially the period of time (now one year) during which aliens who are natives of countries within the operation of the act shall be required to live in foreign contiguous territory, etc., before they are exempt from the provisions of the law.
5. Giving legal authority, through administrative discretion or otherwise, to the end that immediate families shall not be separated because children and parents happen to be born in different countries.



6. Insuring that the always very limited immigration of European origin from New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa shall not be prohibited.

You will note that I have suggested these proposed amendments as desirable rather than indispensable additions to the law from an administrative standpoint. They would be desirable, and in some instances highly desirable, but you have asked me verbally if the law in its present form is not reasonably satisfactory, and I shall answer by saying that with the experience of the past eight months as a guide I am quite sure that some of the administrative difficulties of the past can be avoided or considerably minimized in the future, even though the law is extended without amendment as the House joint resolution provides.

With the hope that the foregoing may be of some value to you and the committee, I am,

Faithfully yours.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I voted for the 3 per cent restriction bill when it was passed a year ago. It has worked well. It has filled the purposes for which it was enacted. It was intended to restrict immigration, and that result has been accomplished.

I have analyzed the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] a moment ago that would seem to indicate that 351,930 immigrants were admissible from Europe this year under the quota fixed by the 3 per cent law. Of that number, 51,000 actually came from northern and western Europe and 119,606 from southern and eastern Europe; but the figures also show, Mr. President, that 15,930 aliens, citizens of northern and western Europe, and 113,243 aliens, citizens of eastern and southern Europe, departed from this country, making a total of those who were admitted of 171,000, and a total of those who departed of 129,000; so that the total gain during the eight months referred to in the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island was only 42,414 people from all of Europe.

Mr. COLT. And only 6,000 from southern and eastern Europe.

Mr. CALDER. Yes; the Senator points out that of that total our increase in population from southern and eastern Europe is only 6,000 and 36,000 from northern and western Europe—surely, Mr. President, a very small number, indeed.

For my part, I am not willing to vote yet to shut out all immigration from all countries in the world. I believe that the restriction has worked well; I believe that it was a good thing to adopt; but I also believe there are very many good people in some of the other countries of the world that can do no harm to us by coming here.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask for a division on my substitute. In order to save time, I will not ask for a roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Georgia.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Georgia proposes to add at the end of the amendment already agreed to the following:

SEC. 4. No alien shall be admitted under the immigration laws to the United States unless transported to the United States in a vessel documented under the laws of the United States, as defined in the shipping act of 1916, as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that when the President of the United States made his address to the Congress in regard to the merchant marine and reached this subject he received more applause than for anything else in his address. I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the amendment, but I hope that it will be incorporated in the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, personally I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I am satisfied, however, that we could not pass through Congress a bill requiring that all aliens coming to the United States shall be carried in American ships. I want to say to the Senator from Georgia that we hope to provide in the merchant marine bill which will be reported to the Senate that at least 50 per cent of such immigrants shall come in American ships. As I said, personally I shall vote for the amendment, but without any special hope that it will be adopted. However, I do want to assure the Senator from Georgia and the Senate that we hope to include in the merchant marine bill a provision requiring that at least 50 per cent of such immigrants be carried in American ships.

Mr. COLT. With regard to this amendment, I may say that the feeling of the committee was, as stated by the Senator from Washington, that it is premature; in other words, that it perhaps could not be applied at the present time; that it might be included in the merchant marine bill, but that now, by reason

of the fact that the merchant marine question is not settled as to the number of vessels and all of such things, it would not be proper to adopt the provision at this time. Therefore the committee voted it down.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It may be asked why we do not put the 50 per cent provision in this joint resolution. We have found that it is quite a difficult proposition to work out the provision under which 50 per cent of the immigrants coming to the United States shall be carried in American vessels. So that can be taken as the reason why we do not propose anything of that sort in connection with the pending measure.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, what I desire to say is merely corroborative of what has been said by the Senator from Washington. The Committee on Commerce is working on this general subject and giving it very close attention. The majority of the committee is in harmony with the principle expressed in this amendment; at any rate I am, and I know the chairman of the committee is. But it seems to me that it would be very unfortunate to lug that question into this measure. Therefore I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a committee amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 5 the committee proposes to strike out "1923" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "1924, unless otherwise repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

Mr. COLT. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. COLT, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. KING conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10740) authorizing the use of special canceling stamps in certain post offices, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. GRIEST, and Mr. BELL were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 2556. An act to advance Maj. Benjamin S. Berry to the permanent rank of major; and

H. R. 7589. An act for the relief of Maj. Ellis B. Miller.

#### NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN WYOMING.

Mr. KENDRICK. I offer a resolution of peculiar importance to the people of my State, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 277) was read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Whereas there have recently appeared in the public press statements purporting to have been authorized by the Department of the Interior to the effect that the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy are negotiating with private parties for the operation of lands included in naval petroleum reserve No. 3, Wyoming No. 1, withdrawn by Executive order of the President dated April 30, 1915, known as the Teapot Dome; Therefore

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, whether such negotiations are pending, and if so the names of all parties, the terms and conditions of all proposed operating agreements, and whether opportunity will be given the public for competitive bidding for the operation of these lands, or whether it is proposed to award a lease or other operating contract or agreement for the entire area to one person, corporation, or association.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, in the subject matter of the resolution there are two questions involved: First, whether there is any present need for the development and operation of the Wyoming naval reserve, known as the Teapot Dome; and, second, if there is such need, whether the interests of the Government would be best preserved by a private or a public sale. I have no doubt that the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy have very excellent reasons for any program they may have adopted, and if it is really their



intention to permit the operation of the Teapot Dome within the near future, that they have a very good explanation for that intention. I am constrained to believe, however, that the interests of the State of Wyoming and the interests of the people of the United States are so intimately involved in this matter that before any arrangement by contract or otherwise is made for the development of this field, the public should be permitted to have some inkling of the terms upon which it is proposed to act.

It has been announced, apparently on the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, that the policy of the Interior and Navy Departments is now to abandon the storage of oil underground and to store it rather in surface tanks prepared for this purpose on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. That such a policy would be in all respects a wise and commendable one with respect to the California naval reserves I am ready to agree, if the information which I have received with respect to the condition of those reserves is correct. I am told that oil wells which have been sunk upon private lands within the boundaries of the California reserve would, in a comparatively short time, drain those fields of their contents, and therefore that it is to the interests of the Government to have similar wells drilled upon the land in the same fields which have been reserved for the use of the Navy. But this is not the condition that prevails in the Teapot Dome. There, if I am correctly advised, no wells whatever have been drilled to production, and no wells have been drilled in the vicinity through which by any possibility this reserve could be drained. It would appear, therefore, that there is no danger of the oil in the Teapot Dome being removed until the Government acts. All the land in this field is owned by the Government, and no one may remove the oil until the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy shall consent.

Is it, then, to the interest of the Government to authorize the development of this field at the present time, to pay private operators for drilling the field, to authorize the necessarily heavy expenditures that would have to be met if tanks sufficiently large to store the content of this dome are to be erected, in order that this oil may be taken from its natural storage place to the seaboard? We have just ratified a treaty by which the size of the Navy has been reduced. It is to be presumed, therefore, that unless the use of coal is to be abandoned on our naval vessels, the Navy will have less rather than a greater need for oil in the immediate future. Not only that but the oil fields on the public domain outside of the naval reserve are not now being worked to capacity. The Government derives a royalty of from 12½ per cent to 33½ per cent upon all oil removed from the Salt Creek field, which lies immediately north of the Teapot Dome. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to take this royalty in oil, and in Wyoming he is doing that, but within the past year the drilling requirements of the Government leases in the Salt Creek field have been suspended and the field is producing scarcely more than one-third of its capacity with the present number of wells. It would seem to follow from this that there is no great need for oil at the present time. Of course it may be said that the royalty oil from the lands outside the naval reserve is used by the Shipping Board; but, of course, since the Shipping Board is not using the full amount of the Government oil which could be produced, the difference between what it is using and the capacity of the field, so far as the Government is concerned, could be assigned to the use of the Navy if the Navy needs more oil. I take it, however, that there is no present need for naval fuel oil, because all of the announcements emanating from the Interior Department indicate that if the Teapot Dome is developed its production will be stored for future use. The question, therefore, is simply whether it is wiser and of greater benefit to the Navy to allow this oil to remain stored underground or to remove it across the country to be stored in surface tanks.

If it should appear from the information afforded by the department that it is expedient to develop the Teapot Dome now, there still remains the inquiry whether the interests of the Government would best be preserved by a private or a public sale. There can be no doubt that if these lands are to be let to private interests for development it should only be after all operators have been given a full and complete opportunity by competitive bidding to offer the Government the best possible return.

Only last June approximately 2,000 acres of outside land in the Salt Creek field were sold at public auction under the authority of the Department of the Interior. Although the price of oil at that time was only 50 cents a barrel, the bonuses paid by the operators, who were eager to secure the leases, amounted to the sum of \$1,687,000. That the lands in the Teapot Dome

are vastly more valuable than these which sold for bonuses of over a million and a half dollars is the general belief of all Wyoming operators, and if these lands were put up at public auction the profit to the Government would be proportionately greater.

Mr. President, in connection with the resolution submitted by me, and as indicating the interest in this matter on the part of the people of my State, I send to the desk a telegram from the Hon. B. B. Brooks, of Casper, Wyo., former governor of the State. Governor Brooks is not only one of the first citizens of Wyoming but he is one of our largest oil operators and is regarded as one of the best authorities on the oil business in the West. His telegram speaks for a large number of oil operators and incorporates the substance of a resolution passed by a convention of oilmen. It also reflects the general sentiment of the people in reference to this question. I ask that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASPER, WYO., April 14, 1922.

Hon. JOHN B. KENDRICK,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At a meeting of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Producers' Association held in this city to-day a resolution was unanimously adopted protesting against the drilling and development of naval reserve No. 3, known as Teapot Dome, and the reported letting of a private contract to Harry Sinclair or any other person or corporation for the following reasons: There is no present market or outlet for the present production of oil. The present production of oil does not affect this naval pool. The oil is not adapted to naval uses nor is there any present naval requirement for additional oil. This association is opposed to the letting of contracts for the development of Government oil reserve by private arrangement and without opportunity for general competitive bidding. Furthermore, the proposed additional production will seriously increase the already overproduction of crude in this territory and result in continued reduction of prices of crude oil to the loss of the producers, the State of Wyoming, public schools, good roads, and national reclamation fund; also the proposed drilling of the Teapot Dome means transporting that oil from the State of Wyoming in its entirety, whereas if produced in the future and when actually needed it will be refined in this State; and we deem the present proposed development and withdrawal not in harmony with purposes of original withdrawal or the policy of the leasing law. The Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Producers' Association includes in its membership fully 95 per cent of the producers and more than 95 per cent of the production in the State. The association urges upon the Wyoming delegation immediate action to prevent the consummation of the proposed contract affecting the Teapot Dome. Immediate action is necessary.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN OIL AND GAS PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,  
By B. B. BROOKS, President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. CALDER. I move that the Senate take up for consideration Senate Joint Resolution 188, which authorizes the appointment of a committee of three Senators by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House by the Speaker to inquire into the conditions of industry and commerce in the United States, for the purpose of securing information on which to base legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the joint resolution be reported.

The joint resolution was read by title, as follows:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let the resolution be read in full, Mr. President.

The reading clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the revival of the industrial activities of the United States is essential to the welfare of the individual as well as the Nation; and Whereas business has been suffering severe depression from which its reconstruction should be stimulated by every legitimate means; and

Whereas business procedure that will, without protecting monopolies, eliminate waste in production or distribution, lower costs, simplify and standardize methods, increase efficiency and the morale of business is a beneficial factor in economic progress; and

Whereas congressional action has already been taken to assist in agricultural cooperative marketing and distribution; and

Whereas the industrial tendency is toward the substitution of research and scientific business methods for previous uncertainty and ignorance; and

Whereas business is hesitating because unable to secure guidance, legal or governmental, which will clearly indicate the proper lines of conduct in business association; and

Whereas business is entitled to know in definite terms what it legally can and cannot do: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee of Congress is hereby created, to be composed of six members, three of whom shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States and the markets of foreign countries, in so far as the same directly affect industry and commerce of the United States, including questions as to production, distribution, labor, and business methods, and to report to Congress and to suggest such legislation, if any, as it may



deem best upon these subjects, with a special reference to the most effective ways and means to revive industry and to stimulate foreign and domestic trade, to stabilize business conditions as to the future, to minimize the danger and distress of recurring periods of business depression with their resultant cycles of general unemployment, and to define the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade.

Sec. 3. That such committee is hereby authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Congress, at Washington or at any other place in the United States, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ experts deemed necessary by such committee, a clerk, and a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before such committee, such stenographer's service to be rendered at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, the expenses involved in carrying out the provisions of this resolution to be paid one-half out of the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 4. That the committee may from time to time report to Congress, and shall submit a final report on or before December 4, 1922.

Mr. OVERMAN. Is this measure brought before the Senate by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I hope it will not be taken up to-day.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator from New York intend to go on with it to-day?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; I desire to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not intend to ask us to go any further with it to-day after it has been made the unfinished business?

Mr. CALDER. I hoped there might be no objection to taking it up.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is the joint resolution which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] said he would ask to have taken up on Monday?

Mr. CALDER. It is the joint resolution to which the Senator from New Jersey referred.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thought the Senator from New Jersey said he would not ask to have it taken up until Monday.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are several Senators opposed to it, and I do not think it would be fair to take it up in their absence.

Mr. CALDER. Why not let us have it made the unfinished business, and then I will ask to have it temporarily laid aside for any other business which may be brought up?

Mr. LODGE. I think we can take it up, if it is so desired.

Mr. OVERMAN. It can be taken up by a majority vote.

Mr. LODGE. We can take it up by a majority vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. We may want to debate it.

Mr. CALDER. There is no objection to taking it up that I know of.

Mr. LODGE. It can be made the unfinished business.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has said that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] stated to some Senators that it would not be taken up until Monday.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from New Jersey said he wanted to have it made the unfinished business, and that he would not press it until Monday; that he understood some Senators desired to be heard on it, and that he would have to be away himself to-day, and would not press it until Monday.

Mr. CALDER. If there is no objection to having the joint resolution made the unfinished business, I shall agree to lay it aside temporarily.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am opposed to taking it up to-day.

Mr. LODGE. It can be laid aside for to-day.

Mr. CALDER. I will not ask for a vote on it to-day; I shall not press it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. OVERMAN. I object.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let me read from the RECORD what the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] said on yesterday:

I wish to announce that on Monday next, immediately following the routine morning business, providing the calling of the calendar does not interfere, I shall ask unanimous consent to consider Senate Joint Resolution No. 188, which provides for a committee of inquiry to endeavor to find some solution of the problem. As I do not want to interfere with the regular business of the Senate, I desire further to announce that should the morning hour on Monday be consumed by the calling of the calendar I shall renew my request for unanimous consent the first morning thereafter when we have a morning hour.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator from New Jersey left this afternoon he said he would like to have it taken up and made the unfinished business, but with the understanding that we should not go on with it before Monday.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the joint resolution being made the unfinished business?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States, for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be temporarily laid aside.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up for consideration at this time the bill (S. 2040) to provide for compulsory school attendance of children, to provide for the taking of a school census, to create the department of school attendance and work permits for the administration of this act and the act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, within the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask, has the bill the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. CAPPER. The report of the committee was unanimous, except that one member of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was not present. The bill has the approval of the District Committee, of the District Commissioners, and of the Board of Education. They have been anxious for several months to get action upon it. It is a very meritorious measure. The District of Columbia has no compulsory school attendance law and those in charge of the schools here say it is exceedingly important that we have enacted for this city as quickly as possible a law which will require attendance in the public schools.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. This is an extremely important bill. It is such a sweeping and vitally important measure that I hope the Senator from Kansas will not press it at this time. I would like to look into it myself.

Mr. CAPPER. It has been before the Senate for two or three months.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. We have been constantly busy on something here in the Senate. I know I have been constantly in my seat and busy on the floor from time to time.

Mr. CAPPER. How much time would the Senator like to have?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Let it go over until some day next week and I shall look into it in the meantime.

Mr. CAPPER. We have delayed it here a number of times and given way to other measures. However, if the Senator asks for more time and will indicate the time he would like to have, I shall not insist upon the consideration of the bill now.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I would like to have it go over until next week so that I may examine the bill and the report. Compulsory school attendance and the regulation of child labor are important questions.

Mr. CAPPER. The bill is in line with the compulsory school attendance laws of every State in the Union, and the work permit feature of it is exactly the same that we now have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Two or three days could not possibly make any difference. I hope the Senator will not think me unreasonable if I request him to let the bill go over until Monday.

Mr. CAPPER. Very well.

#### PENSION LEGISLATION.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, there are a number of pension bills on the calendar which have passed the lower House and which have been pending in the Senate for several months. They ought to be taken up and disposed of. I desire to give notice at this time that on Monday, immediately after the passage of the joint resolution which is now the unfinished business, I shall move to make the pension legislation the unfinished business, commencing with House bill 2158, to provide for the monthly payment of pensions.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURSUM. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I was going to suggest, if there are several pension bills, that some agreement might be entered into that those matters could be taken up some night early next week.

Mr. BURSUM. That course would be very agreeable to me.



Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the calendar will be called on Monday, and I presume the bills referred to by the Senator from New Mexico will be reached then. So very likely they may be taken care of when they are reached in the regular order, and it will not be necessary to set them for a special time.

Mr. BURSUM. I desire to bring them up by agreement or by motion for the reason that they are nearly always objected to on a call of the calendar, when the understanding generally is to take up only such bills as are not objected to. Therefore, I desire to give notice that I shall move to take up the bills to which I have referred immediately after the disposal of the unfinished business now before the Senate.

#### INCOME TAX ON FOREIGN VISITORS.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I have just noticed a very remarkable statement in the New York Times of to-day. I see where Mr. Ralph D. Blumenfeld, who is a part owner of Town and Country, published in London, and chairman of the board and editor of the London Daily Express, recently paid our country a visit and spent about three weeks in the United States. While he was here he purchased somewhere between \$220,000 and \$225,000 worth of machinery. When he attempted to return home, before he could get his sailing papers, he was asked by an official in New York his occupation, his business, and how he spent his time in the United States. The conversation proceeded and the official then desired to know the salary that he drew. He said that he was on no salary, and thereupon the official arbitrarily put him down as worth \$17,000 salary and assessed him \$93.50 income tax for the pleasure of visiting the United States and the further pleasure of purchasing some \$225,000 worth of machinery to be shipped out of the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if such is the law it should not be continued, and if such is not the law the officials should not so disturb people who come to our country to spend their money. If we expect to build up trade in this country by building a tariff wall around us so high that no goods can come in, and then in addition to that when people visit here to spend their money if we are going to tax them before we let them go home, it seems to me we will dry up the industries of our country.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. DIAL. I yield.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if we pursue a course of that character what effect it would have upon Americans who might go abroad, and buy or sell there? Would they not be subjected to some sort of retaliatory legislation?

Mr. DIAL. In the same manner, I should think, and we would then soon have our home products dried up almost absolutely, except as far as we ourselves could use them. It would stop the encouragement of trade with the people of the world. This is one of the most remarkable instances I have ever known. It is, however, just about what could be expected at the present time when we remember the way in which we enact our laws and the defective execution of the laws.

Mr. KING. It seems to me if the present law permits that, it ought to be promptly amended, because that is such an oppressive thing that it will appeal to everyone as being injurious to the American people.

Mr. DIAL. I agree with the Senator. I am satisfied that it will drive away millions of dollars' worth of foreign trade.

#### J. B. GLANVILLE AND OTHERS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 854) to reimburse J. B. Glanville and others for losses and damages sustained by them through the negligent dipping of tick-infested cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture. The bill was read and considered the last time the calendar was called and it went over upon the objection of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], to whom I have spoken and who has no further objection to urge.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. On page 4 there is a clerical error which I wish to correct by an amendment. In the amendment reported by the Committee on Claims, line 13, page 4, I move to strike out "forty-eight" and to insert in lieu "four thousand two hundred and thirty-one."

Mr. FLETCHER. What does that change?

Mr. CURTIS. It states the exact number of cattle. There was a clerical error in the number.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand the claim grows out of the negligence of the agents of the Government?

Mr. CURTIS. It does.

Mr. FLETCHER. It has been reported on favorably by the department?

Mr. CURTIS. It has.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the Department of Agriculture recommend it?

Mr. CURTIS. It is recommended by the department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute reported by the Committee on Claims having been agreed to, it will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. Without objection that vote will be reconsidered and the amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 4, line 13, strike out "forty-eight" and insert in lieu "four thousand two hundred and thirty-one," so as to read:

For losses and damages sustained by them through the negligence of the veterinary inspectors employed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, in their failure to properly dip 4,231 head of Texas cattle, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 15, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the height and the depth, the length and the breadth of Thy love are beyond our knowledge. We praise Thee, for Thou art the King of Love whose goodness faileth never. As we wait in the foreglow of the great Easter day, there comes to us the sublime truth, "Greater love hath no man than this." It glorifies all there is in earth and sky and places supreme value on the worth of man. Be with us this day, and as the light of the morrow breaks upon us may our hearts respond to the heavenly strain that celebrates the world's redemption. O Son of God, rise upon all darkened lands and touch all things and bring them forth into beauty. We would accept the eternal law of achievement, namely, defeat of conquest through sacrifice. May no one in all the world be big enough to make us little enough to hate. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3317. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River between Cass Lake and Bemidji, in or about section 25, township 146 north, range 32 west, Beltrami County, Minn.;

S. 2919. An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of title 2 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended;

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of a tablet to the officers of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2919. An act to extend for the period of two years the provisions of title 2 of the food control and the District of Columbia rents act, approved October 22, 1919, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.